1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
	EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
2	
3	ROCKY WATERS MOUNTAIN INN, LLC,
4	Plaintiff,
5	v. Docket No. 3:19-CV-6
6	THE TRAVELERS INDEMNITY
	COMPANY OF AMERICA,
7	
	Defendant.
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16 17	VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION
18	OF
19	NEIL G. CARLSON
20	NEIE G. CARESON
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	Taken February 28, 2020 By Christine M. Clark, RPR
	2, 2

	Page 2	Page 4
1	APPEARANCES:	1 THE VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of NEIL G, CARLSON is taken on
2		2 this 28th day of February 2020, at Benchmark Reporting
3	MCWHERTOR SCOTT & BOBBITT PLC	3 Agency, 450 South Ninth Street, Suite 450, Minneapolis,
4	54 Exeter Road Suite D	4 Minnesota, commencing at 12:55 p.m.
	Jackson, Tennessee 38305	5 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Good afternoon. We are
5	Phone: 731.664.1340	6 on the record, and the time is 12:55 p.m This is the
6	Email: cscott@gilbertfirm.com	
	By: Clinton H. Scott	
7	(Appearing telephonically)	8 Rocky Waters Motor Inn v. The Travelers Indemnity
	For the Plaintiff	9 Company of America, Case Number 3:19-CV-6, filed in the
8 9		10 United States District Court, Eastern District of
10	FORAN GLENNON PALANDECH PONZI & RUDOLPH PC	11 Tennessee.
	222 North LaSalle Street	12 The court reporter's name is Christine Clark. My
11	Suite 1400 Chicago, Illinois 60601	13 name is Stephen Smith, the legal videographer. We are
12	Phone: 312.863.5000	14 with Benchmark Reporting Agency.
	Email: bdevilling@fgppr.com	15 Would the attorneys present please introduce
13	But Brian E Davallin-	16 themselves?
14	By: Brian E. Develling For the Defendant	17 MR. DEVILLING: Brian Devilling, for
15	. J. and Barandane	18 Travelers.
16		19 MR. SCOTT: Clint Scott, for the plaintiff.
17 18	ALSO PRESENT: Stephen Smith, Legal Videographer	20 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Thank you very much. The
19	Stephen Smith, Legal Videographer	21 court reporter will now swear in the witness and then
20		
21		
22 23		23 NEIL G. CARLSON,
24		24 a witness in the above-entitled action,
25		25 after having been first duly sworn,
	Page 3	Page 5
		rage 5
1	INDEX	1 deposes and testifies as follows:
1 2	INDEX	
	I N D E X Examination by Mr. Devilling, Page 5	1 deposes and testifies as follows:
		1 deposes and testifies as follows: 2 EXAMINATION 3 BY MR, DEVILLING:
2	Examination by Mr. Devilling, Page 5	deposes and testifies as follows: EXAMINATION BY MR, DEVILLING: Q, Hello, Mr. Carlson, My name is Brian Devilling, I
2 3 4		deposes and testifies as follows: EXAMINATION BY MR. DEVILLING: Q. Hello, Mr. Carlson, My name is Brian Devilling, I represent Travelers in the Rocky Waters Motor Inn versus
2 3 4 5	Examination by Mr. Devilling, Page 5 INDEX OF EXHIBITS	deposes and testifies as follows: EXAMINATION BY MR, DEVILLING: Q, Hello, Mr, Carlson, My name is Brian Devilling, I represent Travelers in the Rocky Waters Motor Inn versus Travelers Indemnity case,
2 3 4 5 6	Examination by Mr. Devilling, Page 5 INDEX OF EXHIBITS NUMBER DESCRIPTION	1 deposes and testifies as follows: 2 EXAMINATION 3 BY MR, DEVILLING: 4 Q, Hello, Mr. Carlson, My name is Brian Devilling, I 5 represent Travelers in the Rocky Waters Motor Inn versus 6 Travelers Indemnity case, 7 Have you given a deposition before?
2 3 4 5 6 7	Examination by Mr. Devilling, Page 5 INDEX OF EXHIBITS NUMBER DESCRIPTION 1 Mr. Carlson's CV, Page 7	1 deposes and testifies as follows: 2 EXAMINATION 3 BY MR, DEVILLING: 4 Q, Hello, Mr. Carlson, My name is Brian Devilling, I 5 represent Travelers in the Rocky Waters Motor Inn versus 6 Travelers Indemnity case, 7 Have you given a deposition before? 8 A. Yes, I have, sir.
2 3 4 5 6	Examination by Mr. Devilling, Page 5 INDEX OF EXHIBITS NUMBER DESCRIPTION 1 Mr. Carlson's CV, Page 7 2 January 13, 2018 Report, Rocky Waters Motor	1 deposes and testifies as follows: 2 EXAMINATION 3 BY MR, DEVILLING: 4 Q, Hello, Mr. Carlson, My name is Brian Devilling, I 5 represent Travelers in the Rocky Waters Motor Inn versus 6 Travelers Indemnity case, 7 Have you given a deposition before? 8 A. Yes, I have, sir. 9 Q. All right. How many times?
2 3 4 5 6 7	Examination by Mr. Devilling, Page 5 INDEX OF EXHIBITS NUMBER DESCRIPTION 1 Mr. Carlson's CV, Page 7	1 deposes and testifies as follows: 2 EXAMINATION 3 BY MR, DEVILLING: 4 Q, Hello, Mr. Carlson, My name is Brian Devilling, I 5 represent Travelers in the Rocky Waters Motor Inn versus 6 Travelers Indemnity case, 7 Have you given a deposition before? 8 A. Yes, I have, sir. 9 Q. All right. How many times? 10 A. Between less than 20, but more probably more than 10.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Examination by Mr. Devilling, Page 5 INDEX OF EXHIBITS NUMBER DESCRIPTION 1 Mr. Carlson's CV, Page 7 2 January 13, 2018 Report, Rocky Waters Motor	1 deposes and testifies as follows: 2 EXAMINATION 3 BY MR, DEVILLING: 4 Q, Hello, Mr. Carlson, My name is Brian Devilling, I 5 represent Travelers in the Rocky Waters Motor Inn versus 6 Travelers Indemnity case, 7 Have you given a deposition before? 8 A. Yes, I have, sir. 9 Q. All right. How many times? 10 A. Between less than 20, but more probably more than 10. 11 Q. Okay, Standard ground rules apply. If you could wait
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Examination by Mr. Devilling, Page 5 INDEX OF EXHIBITS NUMBER DESCRIPTION 1 Mr. Carlson's CV, Page 7 2 January 13, 2018 Report, Rocky Waters Motor Inn, Page 19	1 deposes and testifies as follows: 2 EXAMINATION 3 BY MR, DEVILLING: 4 Q. Hello, Mr. Carlson, My name is Brian Devilling, I 5 represent Travelers in the Rocky Waters Motor Inn versus 6 Travelers Indemnity case, 7 Have you given a deposition before? 8 A. Yes, I have, sir. 9 Q. All right. How many times? 10 A. Between less than 20, but more probably more than 10. 11 Q. Okay, Standard ground rules apply. If you could wait 12 wait to give your answer until I'm done asking my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Examination by Mr. Devilling, Page 5 INDEX OF EXHIBITS NUMBER DESCRIPTION 1 Mr. Carlson's CV, Page 7 2 January 13, 2018 Report, Rocky Waters Motor Inn, Page 19	1 deposes and testifies as follows: 2 EXAMINATION 3 BY MR, DEVILLING: 4 Q, Hello, Mr. Carlson, My name is Brian Devilling, I 5 represent Travelers in the Rocky Waters Motor Inn versus 6 Travelers Indemnity case, 7 Have you given a deposition before? 8 A. Yes, I have, sir. 9 Q. All right. How many times? 10 A. Between less than 20, but more probably more than 10. 11 Q. Okay, Standard ground rules apply. If you could wait
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Examination by Mr. Devilling, Page 5 INDEX OF EXHIBITS NUMBER DESCRIPTION 1 Mr. Carlson's CV, Page 7 2 January 13, 2018 Report, Rocky Waters Motor Inn, Page 19 3 January 13, 2018 Report, Days Inn, Page 20	1 deposes and testifies as follows: 2 EXAMINATION 3 BY MR, DEVILLING: 4 Q. Hello, Mr. Carlson, My name is Brian Devilling, I 5 represent Travelers in the Rocky Waters Motor Inn versus 6 Travelers Indemnity case, 7 Have you given a deposition before? 8 A. Yes, I have, sir. 9 Q. All right. How many times? 10 A. Between less than 20, but more probably more than 10. 11 Q. Okay, Standard ground rules apply. If you could wait 12 wait to give your answer until I'm done asking my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Examination by Mr. Devilling, Page 5 INDEX OF EXHIBITS NUMBER DESCRIPTION 1 Mr. Carlson's CV, Page 7 2 January 13, 2018 Report, Rocky Waters Motor Inn, Page 19 3 January 13, 2018 Report, Days Inn, Page 20	1 deposes and testifies as follows: 2 EXAMINATION 3 BY MR, DEVILLING: 4 Q, Hello, Mr. Carlson, My name is Brian Devilling, I 5 represent Travelers in the Rocky Waters Motor Inn versus 6 Travelers Indemnity case, 7 Have you given a deposition before? 8 A. Yes, I have, sir. 9 Q. All right. How many times? 10 A. Between less than 20, but more probably more than 10. 11 Q, Okay, Standard ground rules apply. If you could wait 12 wait to give your answer until I'm done asking my 13 question. Okay?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Examination by Mr. Devilling, Page 5 INDEX OF EXHIBITS NUMBER DESCRIPTION 1 Mr. Carlson's CV, Page 7 2 January 13, 2018 Report, Rocky Waters Motor Inn, Page 19 3 January 13, 2018 Report, Days Inn, Page 20	1 deposes and testifies as follows: 2 EXAMINATION 3 BY MR, DEVILLING: 4 Q, Hello, Mr. Carlson, My name is Brian Devilling, I 5 represent Travelers in the Rocky Waters Motor Inn versus 6 Travelers Indemnity case, 7 Have you given a deposition before? 8 A. Yes, I have, sir. 9 Q. All right. How many times? 10 A. Between less than 20, but more probably more than 10. 11 Q. Okay, Standard ground rules apply. If you could wait 12 wait to give your answer until I'm done asking my 13 question. Okay? 14 A. Yes, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Examination by Mr. Devilling, Page 5 INDEX OF EXHIBITS NUMBER DESCRIPTION 1 Mr. Carlson's CV, Page 7 2 January 13, 2018 Report, Rocky Waters Motor Inn, Page 19 3 January 13, 2018 Report, Days Inn, Page 20	1 deposes and testifies as follows: 2 EXAMINATION 3 BY MR, DEVILLING: 4 Q, Hello, Mr. Carlson, My name is Brian Devilling, I 5 represent Travelers in the Rocky Waters Motor Inn versus 6 Travelers Indemnity case, 7 Have you given a deposition before? 8 A. Yes, I have, sir. 9 Q. All right. How many times? 10 A. Between less than 20, but more probably more than 10. 11 Q, Okay, Standard ground rules apply. If you could wait 12 wait to give your answer until I'm done asking my 13 question. Okay? 14 A. Yes, sir. 15 Q, And if you need a break at any time, let me know, Okay?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Examination by Mr. Devilling, Page 5 INDEX OF EXHIBITS NUMBER DESCRIPTION 1 Mr. Carlson's CV, Page 7 2 January 13, 2018 Report, Rocky Waters Motor Inn, Page 19 3 January 13, 2018 Report, Days Inn, Page 20	1 deposes and testifies as follows: 2 EXAMINATION 3 BY MR, DEVILLING: 4 Q, Hello, Mr. Carlson, My name is Brian Devilling, I 5 represent Travelers in the Rocky Waters Motor Inn versus 6 Travelers Indemnity case, 7 Have you given a deposition before? 8 A. Yes, I have, sir. 9 Q. All right. How many times? 10 A. Between less than 20, but more probably more than 10. 11 Q, Okay, Standard ground rules apply. If you could wait 12 wait to give your answer until I'm done asking my 13 question. Okay? 14 A. Yes, sir. 15 Q, And if you need a break at any time, let me know. Okay? 16 A. I will, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Examination by Mr. Devilling, Page 5 INDEX OF EXHIBITS NUMBER DESCRIPTION 1 Mr. Carlson's CV, Page 7 2 January 13, 2018 Report, Rocky Waters Motor Inn, Page 19 3 January 13, 2018 Report, Days Inn, Page 20	1 deposes and testifies as follows: 2 EXAMINATION 3 BY MR, DEVILLING: 4 Q, Hello, Mr. Carlson, My name is Brian Devilling, I 5 represent Travelers in the Rocky Waters Motor Inn versus 6 Travelers Indemnity case, 7 Have you given a deposition before? 8 A. Yes, I have, sir. 9 Q. All right. How many times? 10 A. Between less than 20, but more probably more than 10. 11 Q. Okay, Standard ground rules apply. If you could wait 12 wait to give your answer until I'm done asking my 13 question. Okay? 14 A. Yes, sir. 15 Q, And if you need a break at any time, let me know. Okay? 16 A. I will, sir. 17 Q, And if you can answer yes or no as opposed to uh-huh or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Examination by Mr. Devilling, Page 5 INDEX OF EXHIBITS NUMBER DESCRIPTION 1 Mr. Carlson's CV, Page 7 2 January 13, 2018 Report, Rocky Waters Motor Inn, Page 19 3 January 13, 2018 Report, Days Inn, Page 20	1 deposes and testifies as follows: 2 EXAMINATION 3 BY MR, DEVILLING: 4 Q. Hello, Mr. Carlson, My name is Brian Devilling, I 5 represent Travelers in the Rocky Waters Motor Inn versus 6 Travelers Indemnity case. 7 Have you given a deposition before? 8 A. Yes, I have, sir. 9 Q. All right. How many times? 10 A. Between less than 20, but more probably more than 10. 11 Q. Okay, Standard ground rules apply. If you could wait 12 wait to give your answer until I'm done asking my 13 question. Okay? 14 A. Yes, sir. 15 Q. And if you need a break at any time, let me know. Okay? 16 A. I will, sir. 17 Q. And if you can answer yes or no as opposed to uh-huh or 18 uh-uh, it makes it easier for the court reporter to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Examination by Mr. Devilling, Page 5 INDEX OF EXHIBITS NUMBER DESCRIPTION 1 Mr. Carlson's CV, Page 7 2 January 13, 2018 Report, Rocky Waters Motor Inn, Page 19 3 January 13, 2018 Report, Days Inn, Page 20	1 deposes and testifies as follows: 2 EXAMINATION 3 BY MR, DEVILLING: 4 Q, Hello, Mr. Carlson, My name is Brian Devilling, I 5 represent Travelers in the Rocky Waters Motor Inn versus 6 Travelers Indemnity case, 7 Have you given a deposition before? 8 A. Yes, I have, sir. 9 Q. All right. How many times? 10 A. Between less than 20, but more probably more than 10. 11 Q. Okay, Standard ground rules apply. If you could wait 12 wait to give your answer until I'm done asking my 13 question. Okay? 14 A. Yes, sir. 15 Q, And if you need a break at any time, let me know. Okay? 16 A. I will, sir. 17 Q, And if you can answer yes or no as opposed to uh-huh or 18 uh-uh, it makes it easier for the court reporter to 19 transcribe. 20 A. Yes, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Examination by Mr. Devilling, Page 5 INDEX OF EXHIBITS NUMBER DESCRIPTION 1 Mr. Carlson's CV, Page 7 2 January 13, 2018 Report, Rocky Waters Motor Inn, Page 19 3 January 13, 2018 Report, Days Inn, Page 20	1 deposes and testifies as follows: 2 EXAMINATION 3 BY MR, DEVILLING: 4 Q. Hello, Mr. Carlson, My name is Brian Devilling, I 5 represent Travelers in the Rocky Waters Motor Inn versus 6 Travelers Indemnity case. 7 Have you given a deposition before? 8 A. Yes, I have, sir. 9 Q. All right. How many times? 10 A. Between less than 20, but more probably more than 10. 11 Q. Okay. Standard ground rules apply. If you could wait 12 wait to give your answer until I'm done asking my 13 question. Okay? 14 A. Yes, sir. 15 Q. And if you need a break at any time, let me know. Okay? 16 A. I will, sir. 17 Q. And if you can answer yes or no as opposed to uh-huh or 18 uh-uh, it makes it easier for the court reporter to 19 transcribe. 20 A. Yes, sir. 21 Q. And if you don't understand a question that I ask, just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Examination by Mr. Devilling, Page 5 INDEX OF EXHIBITS NUMBER DESCRIPTION 1 Mr. Carlson's CV, Page 7 2 January 13, 2018 Report, Rocky Waters Motor Inn, Page 19 3 January 13, 2018 Report, Days Inn, Page 20	1 deposes and testifies as follows: 2 EXAMINATION 3 BY MR, DEVILLING: 4 Q, Hello, Mr. Carlson, My name is Brian Devilling, I 5 represent Travelers in the Rocky Waters Motor Inn versus 6 Travelers Indemnity case. 7 Have you given a deposition before? 8 A. Yes, I have, sir. 9 Q. All right. How many times? 10 A. Between less than 20, but more probably more than 10. 11 Q. Okay, Standard ground rules apply. If you could wait 12 wait to give your answer until I'm done asking my 13 question. Okay? 14 A. Yes, sir. 15 Q, And if you need a break at any time, let me know. Okay? 16 A. I will, sir. 17 Q, And if you can answer yes or no as opposed to uh-huh or 18 uh-uh, it makes it easier for the court reporter to 19 transcribe. 20 A. Yes, sir. 21 Q, And if you don't understand a question that I ask, just 22 let me know and I'll rephrase it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Examination by Mr. Devilling, Page 5 INDEX OF EXHIBITS NUMBER DESCRIPTION 1 Mr. Carlson's CV, Page 7 2 January 13, 2018 Report, Rocky Waters Motor Inn, Page 19 3 January 13, 2018 Report, Days Inn, Page 20	1 deposes and testifies as follows: 2 EXAMINATION 3 BY MR, DEVILLING: 4 Q. Hello, Mr. Carlson, My name is Brian Devilling, I 5 represent Travelers in the Rocky Waters Motor Inn versus 6 Travelers Indemnity case. 7 Have you given a deposition before? 8 A. Yes, I have, sir. 9 Q. All right. How many times? 10 A. Between less than 20, but more probably more than 10. 11 Q. Okay, Standard ground rules apply. If you could wait 12 wait to give your answer until I'm done asking my 13 question. Okay? 14 A. Yes, sir. 15 Q. And if you need a break at any time, let me know. Okay? 16 A. I will, sir. 17 Q. And if you can answer yes or no as opposed to uh-huh or 18 uh-uh, it makes it easier for the court reporter to 19 transcribe. 20 A. Yes, sir. 21 Q. And if you don't understand a question that I ask, just 22 let me know and I'll rephrase it. 23 A. Thank you, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Examination by Mr. Devilling, Page 5 INDEX OF EXHIBITS NUMBER DESCRIPTION 1 Mr. Carlson's CV, Page 7 2 January 13, 2018 Report, Rocky Waters Motor Inn, Page 19 3 January 13, 2018 Report, Days Inn, Page 20	1 deposes and testifies as follows: 2 EXAMINATION 3 BY MR, DEVILLING: 4 Q, Hello, Mr. Carlson, My name is Brian Devilling, I 5 represent Travelers in the Rocky Waters Motor Inn versus 6 Travelers Indemnity case. 7 Have you given a deposition before? 8 A. Yes, I have, sir. 9 Q. All right. How many times? 10 A. Between less than 20, but more probably more than 10. 11 Q. Okay, Standard ground rules apply. If you could wait 12 wait to give your answer until I'm done asking my 13 question. Okay? 14 A. Yes, sir. 15 Q, And if you need a break at any time, let me know. Okay? 16 A. I will, sir. 17 Q, And if you can answer yes or no as opposed to uh-huh or 18 uh-uh, it makes it easier for the court reporter to 19 transcribe. 20 A. Yes, sir. 21 Q, And if you don't understand a question that I ask, just 22 let me know and I'll rephrase it.

	Daga C	Daga S
	Page 6	Page 8
1	Department of Environmental Health and Safety, as an	1 different. How about with respect to analyzing debris
2	industrial hygienist and as a public health specialist,	2 from a wildfire?
3	and I also do consulting work as President of N.G.	3 A. Nothing specific to analyzing debris from a wildfire
4	Carlson Analytical. And I'm representing N.G. Carlson	4 Q. Okay. Let's see. You're what was your undergraduate
5	Analytical and not any way affiliated with the	5 degree?
6	University of Minnesota with respect to this case.	6 A. Biology, with a minor in chemistry.
7	Q. Okay, All the work you did in this case is through N.G.	7 Q. Okay. That's from the University of Minnesota, Morris,
8	Analytical, correct?	8 correct?
9	A. That is correct, sir. Yes.	9 A. That is correct, yes.
10	Q. I'm sorry. N.G. Carlson Analytical.	Q. And then you got an MS in General Environmental Health
11	A. That's correct. N.G. And I think, for legal purposes,	11 correct?
12	I think it's N.G. Carlson Analytical, Inc., but	12 A. Yes. From the University of Minnesota.
13	Q. Okay. In your position with the University of	Q. Was any of your training for your Master's in General
14	Minnesota, do you do any teaching?	14 Environmental Health specifically pertinent to wildfire
15	A. I do adjunct faculty teaching, yes, sir.	debris or wildfire analysis?
16	Q: And what courses do you teach?	A. Not specific to wildfire analysis.
17	A. I assist with teaching a course in laboratory analysis	17 Q. Okay. Excuse me. At this point in your career, have
18	for industrial hygiene students. I teach a course on	you I assume that you've analyzed debris under a
19	indoor air with respect to housing and housing	microscope on multiple occasions for the purpose of
20	inspection for a group on the St. Paul campus. I also	20 determining whether it was a contains wildfire
21	teach an architecture class on indoor air quality, and	21 residue?
22	these are typically one to two session pieces. I'm	A. Let's see. Yes. And it wouldn't be specific to
23	I'm assisting the the faculty member. I also teach a	23 wildfire residue, if I may add. It would be soot or
24	course with the Midwest Center on fungal remediation, and we do that as needed.	char, irrespective of what the source was.
25	and we do that as needed.	25 Q. Okay
	Page 7	Page 9
1	Page 7 Q: Have you taught any courses on or portions of any	Page 9 1 A. Does that clarify?
1 2	_	
	$Q_{\scriptscriptstyle{0}}$ Have you taught any courses on or portions of any	1 A. Does that clarify?
2	Q. Have you taught any courses on or portions of any courses on any topics related to wildfire analysis?	1 A. Does that clarify? 2 Q. Yes.
2	Q. Have you taught any courses on or portions of any courses on any topics related to wildfire analysis? A. No courses on wildfire analysis, sir.	1 A. Does that clarify? 2 Q. Yes.: 3 A. Okay.
2 3 4	Q. Have you taught any courses on or portions of any courses on any topics related to wildfire analysis? A. No courses on wildfire analysis, sir. Q. Okay, I'll show you what we've marked as Exhibit 1. I	 A. Does that clarify? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Yes, it does. Do you know how many how many cases
2 3 4 5	Q. Have you taught any courses on or portions of any courses on any topics related to wildfire analysis? A. No courses on wildfire analysis, sir. Q. Okay, I'll show you what we've marked as Exhibit 1. I believe this is a copy of your CV, correct?	 A. Does that clarify? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Yes, it does. Do you know how many how many cases you've been involved in or analyzed involving claims
2 3 4 5 6	Q. Have you taught any courses on or portions of any courses on any topics related to wildfire analysis? A. No courses on wildfire analysis, sir. Q. Okay. I'll show you what we've marked as Exhibit 1. I believe this is a copy of your CV, correct? A. Yes, sir. That is.	 A. Does that clarify? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Yes, it does. Do you know how many how many cases you've been involved in or analyzed involving claims that wildfire debris has caused damage to property?
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. Have you taught any courses on or portions of any courses on any topics related to wildfire analysis? A. No courses on wildfire analysis, sir. Q. Okay, I'll show you what we've marked as Exhibit 1. I believe this is a copy of your CV, correct? A. Yes, sir. That is. Q. All right. And can you just look through it and let me	A. Does that clarify? Q. Yes.: A. Okay. Q. Yes, it does. Do you know how many how many cases you've been involved in or analyzed involving claims that wildfire debris has caused damage to property? A. I wouldn't know the exact one because when I get the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. Have you taught any courses on or portions of any courses on any topics related to wildfire analysis? A. No courses on wildfire analysis, sir. Q. Okay. I'll show you what we've marked as Exhibit 1. I believe this is a copy of your CV, correct? A. Yes, sir. That is. Q. All right. And can you just look through it and let me know if it's current?	 A. Does that clarify? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Yes, it does. Do you know how many how many cases you've been involved in or analyzed involving claims that wildfire debris has caused damage to property? A. I wouldn't know the exact one because when I get the reports it doesn't specify whether it was a building
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. Have you taught any courses on or portions of any courses on any topics related to wildfire analysis? A. No courses on wildfire analysis, sir. Q. Okay. I'll show you what we've marked as Exhibit 1. I believe this is a copy of your CV, correct? A. Yes, sir. That is. Q. All right. And can you just look through it and let me know if it's current? A. It's the most current one that I put together, yes.	 A. Does that clarify? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Yes, it does. Do you know how many how many cases you've been involved in or analyzed involving claims that wildfire debris has caused damage to property? A. I wouldn't know the exact one because when I get the reports it doesn't specify whether it was a building fire. So an internal source or an external source
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. Have you taught any courses on or portions of any courses on any topics related to wildfire analysis? A. No courses on wildfire analysis, sir. Q. Okay. I'll show you what we've marked as Exhibit 1. I believe this is a copy of your CV, correct? A. Yes, sir. That is. Q. All right. And can you just look through it and let me know if it's current? A. It's the most current one that I put together, yes. Q. Any additional seminars, publications, licenses, degrees	A. Does that clarify? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Yes, it does. Do you know how many how many cases you've been involved in or analyzed involving claims that wildfire debris has caused damage to property? A. I wouldn't know the exact one because when I get the reports it doesn't specify whether it was a building fire. So an internal source or an external source wildfire. So I couldn't give you a precise number on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. Have you taught any courses on or portions of any courses on any topics related to wildfire analysis? A. No courses on wildfire analysis, sir. Q. Okay. I'll show you what we've marked as Exhibit 1. I believe this is a copy of your CV, correct? A. Yes, sir. That is. Q. All right. And can you just look through it and let me know if it's current? A. It's the most current one that I put together, yes. Q. Any additional seminars, publications, licenses, degrees that need to be added to this to make it complete?	A. Does that clarify? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Yes, it does. Do you know how many how many cases you've been involved in or analyzed involving claims that wildfire debris has caused damage to property? A. I wouldn't know the exact one because when I get the reports it doesn't specify whether it was a building fire. So an internal source or an external source wildfire. So I couldn't give you a precise number on that. I can give you a range, if that would be helpful.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. Have you taught any courses on or portions of any courses on any topics related to wildfire analysis? A. No courses on wildfire analysis, sir. Q. Okay. I'll show you what we've marked as Exhibit 1. I believe this is a copy of your CV, correct? A. Yes, sir. That is. Q. All right. And can you just look through it and let me know if it's current? A. It's the most current one that I put together, yes. Q. Any additional seminars, publications, licenses, degrees that need to be added to this to make it complete? A. Well, let me look. Let me see if they have the one. I	A. Does that clarify? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Yes, it does. Do you know how many how many cases you've been involved in or analyzed involving claims that wildfire debris has caused damage to property? A. I wouldn't know the exact one because when I get the reports it doesn't specify whether it was a building fire. So an internal source or an external source wildfire. So I couldn't give you a precise number on that. I can give you a range, if that would be helpful. Q. Sure.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. Have you taught any courses on or portions of any courses on any topics related to wildfire analysis? A. No courses on wildfire analysis, sir. Q. Okay. I'll show you what we've marked as Exhibit 1. I believe this is a copy of your CV, correct? A. Yes, sir. That is. Q. All right. And can you just look through it and let me know if it's current? A. It's the most current one that I put together, yes. Q. Any additional seminars, publications, licenses, degrees that need to be added to this to make it complete? A. Well, let me look. Let me see if they have the one. I think the one that might be relevant to this case is	1 A. Does that clarify? 2 Q. Yes. 3 A. Okay. 4 Q. Yes, it does. Do you know how many how many cases 5 you've been involved in or analyzed involving claims 6 that wildfire debris has caused damage to property? 7 A. I wouldn't know the exact one because when I get the 8 reports it doesn't specify whether it was a building 9 fire. So an internal source or an external source 10 wildfire. So I couldn't give you a precise number on 11 that. I can give you a range, if that would be helpful. 12 Q. Sure. 13 A. I would say more than probably 20 and definitely less
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. Have you taught any courses on or portions of any courses on any topics related to wildfire analysis? A. No courses on wildfire analysis, sir. Q. Okay. I'll show you what we've marked as Exhibit 1. I believe this is a copy of your CV, correct? A. Yes, sir. That is. Q. All right. And can you just look through it and let me know if it's current? A. It's the most current one that I put together, yes. Q. Any additional seminars, publications, licenses, degrees that need to be added to this to make it complete? A. Well, let me look. Let me see if they have the one. I think the one that might be relevant to this case is that I reviewed a webinar, although I did not attend it.	1 A. Does that clarify? 2 Q. Yes. 3 A. Okay. 4 Q. Yes, it does. Do you know how many how many cases 5 you've been involved in or analyzed involving claims 6 that wildfire debris has caused damage to property? 7 A. I wouldn't know the exact one because when I get the 8 reports it doesn't specify whether it was a building 9 fire. So an internal source or an external source 10 wildfire. So I couldn't give you a precise number on 11 that. I can give you a range, if that would be helpful. 12 Q. Sure. 13 A. I would say more than probably 20 and definitely less 14 than 100.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. Have you taught any courses on or portions of any courses on any topics related to wildfire analysis? A. No courses on wildfire analysis, sir. Q. Okay, I'll show you what we've marked as Exhibit 1. I believe this is a copy of your CV, correct? A. Yes, sir. That is. Q. All right. And can you just look through it and let me know if it's current? A. It's the most current one that I put together, yes. Q. Any additional seminars, publications, licenses, degrees that need to be added to this to make it complete? A. Well, let me look. Let me see if they have the one. I think the one that might be relevant to this case is that I reviewed a webinar, although I did not attend it. It was on smoke and soot analysis, from EMLab P&K. So I	1 A. Does that clarify? 2 Q. Yes. 3 A. Okay. 4 Q. Yes, it does. Do you know how many how many cases 5 you've been involved in or analyzed involving claims 6 that wildfire debris has caused damage to property? 7 A. I wouldn't know the exact one because when I get the 8 reports it doesn't specify whether it was a building 9 fire. So an internal source or an external source 10 wildfire. So I couldn't give you a precise number on 11 that. I can give you a range, if that would be helpful. 12 Q. Sure. 13 A. I would say more than probably 20 and definitely less 14 than 100. 15 Q. Okay. How many times have you analyzed debris for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. Have you taught any courses on or portions of any courses on any topics related to wildfire analysis? A. No courses on wildfire analysis, sir. Q. Okay. I'll show you what we've marked as Exhibit 1. I believe this is a copy of your CV, correct? A. Yes, sir. That is. Q. All right. And can you just look through it and let me know if it's current? A. It's the most current one that I put together, yes. Q. Any additional seminars, publications, licenses, degrees that need to be added to this to make it complete? A. Well, let me look. Let me see if they have the one. I think the one that might be relevant to this case is that I reviewed a webinar, although I did not attend it. It was on smoke and soot analysis, from EMLab P&K. So I don't know if that one's listed here, but I think that would be the relevant one. Q. Okay.	A. Does that clarify? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Yes, it does. Do you know how many how many cases you've been involved in or analyzed involving claims that wildfire debris has caused damage to property? A. I wouldn't know the exact one because when I get the reports it doesn't specify whether it was a building fire. So an internal source or an external source wildfire. So I couldn't give you a precise number on that. I can give you a range, if that would be helpful. Q. Sure. A. I would say more than probably 20 and definitely less than 100. Q. Okay. How many times have you analyzed debris for the purpose of determining the level of soot or char in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. Have you taught any courses on or portions of any courses on any topics related to wildfire analysis? A. No courses on wildfire analysis, sir. Q. Okay. I'll show you what we've marked as Exhibit 1. I believe this is a copy of your CV, correct? A. Yes, sir. That is. Q. All right. And can you just look through it and let me know if it's current? A. It's the most current one that I put together, yes. Q. Any additional seminars, publications, licenses, degrees that need to be added to this to make it complete? A. Well, let me look. Let me see if they have the one. I think the one that might be relevant to this case is that I reviewed a webinar, although I did not attend it. It was on smoke and soot analysis, from EMLab P&K. So I don't know if that one's listed here, but I think that would be the relevant one.	A. Does that clarify? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Yes, it does. Do you know how many how many cases you've been involved in or analyzed involving claims that wildfire debris has caused damage to property? A. I wouldn't know the exact one because when I get the reports it doesn't specify whether it was a building fire. So an internal source or an external source wildfire. So I couldn't give you a precise number on that. I can give you a range, if that would be helpful. Q. Sure. A. I would say more than probably 20 and definitely less than 100. Q. Okay. How many times have you analyzed debris for the purpose of determining the level of soot or char in the debris?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. Have you taught any courses on or portions of any courses on any topics related to wildfire analysis? A. No courses on wildfire analysis, sir. Q. Okay. I'll show you what we've marked as Exhibit 1. I believe this is a copy of your CV, correct? A. Yes, sir. That is. Q. All right. And can you just look through it and let me know if it's current? A. It's the most current one that I put together, yes. Q. Any additional seminars, publications, licenses, degrees that need to be added to this to make it complete? A. Well, let me look. Let me see if they have the one. I think the one that might be relevant to this case is that I reviewed a webinar, although I did not attend it. It was on smoke and soot analysis, from EMLab P&K. So I don't know if that one's listed here, but I think that would be the relevant one. Q. Okay.	A. Does that clarify? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Yes, it does. Do you know how many how many cases you've been involved in or analyzed involving claims that wildfire debris has caused damage to property? A. I wouldn't know the exact one because when I get the reports it doesn't specify whether it was a building fire. So an internal source or an external source wildfire. So I couldn't give you a precise number on that. I can give you a range, if that would be helpful. Q. Sure. A. I would say more than probably 20 and definitely less than 100. Q. Okay. How many times have you analyzed debris for the purpose of determining the level of soot or char in the debris? A. That would be more then 100, less than 200.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. Have you taught any courses on or portions of any courses on any topics related to wildfire analysis? A. No courses on wildfire analysis, sir. Q. Okay. I'll show you what we've marked as Exhibit 1. I believe this is a copy of your CV, correct? A. Yes, sir. That is. Q. All right. And can you just look through it and let me know if it's current? A. It's the most current one that I put together, yes. Q. Any additional seminars, publications, licenses, degrees that need to be added to this to make it complete? A. Well, let me look. Let me see if they have the one. I think the one that might be relevant to this case is that I reviewed a webinar, although I did not attend it. It was on smoke and soot analysis, from EMLab P&K. So I don't know if that one's listed here, but I think that would be the relevant one. Q. Okay. A. There are probably other ones, but I don't think they'd	A. Does that clarify? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Yes, it does. Do you know how many how many cases you've been involved in or analyzed involving claims that wildfire debris has caused damage to property? A. I wouldn't know the exact one because when I get the reports it doesn't specify whether it was a building fire. So an internal source or an external source wildfire. So I couldn't give you a precise number on that. I can give you a range, if that would be helpful. Q. Sure. A. I would say more than probably 20 and definitely less than 100. Q. Okay. How many times have you analyzed debris for the purpose of determining the level of soot or char in the debris? A. That would be more then 100, less than 200. Q. Okay. Are you the sole owner of N.G. Carlson
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. Have you taught any courses on or portions of any courses on any topics related to wildfire analysis? A. No courses on wildfire analysis, sir. Q. Okay. I'll show you what we've marked as Exhibit 1. I believe this is a copy of your CV, correct? A. Yes, sir. That is. Q. All right. And can you just look through it and let me know if it's current? A. It's the most current one that I put together, yes. Q. Any additional seminars, publications, licenses, degrees that need to be added to this to make it complete? A. Well, let me look. Let me see if they have the one. I think the one that might be relevant to this case is that I reviewed a webinar, although I did not attend it. It was on smoke and soot analysis, from EMLab P&K. So I don't know if that one's listed here, but I think that would be the relevant one. Q. Okay. A. There are probably other ones, but I don't think they'd be relevant to this case.	A. Does that clarify? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Yes, it does. Do you know how many how many cases you've been involved in or analyzed involving claims that wildfire debris has caused damage to property? A. I wouldn't know the exact one because when I get the reports it doesn't specify whether it was a building fire. So an internal source or an external source wildfire. So I couldn't give you a precise number on that. I can give you a range, if that would be helpful. Q. Sure. A. I would say more than probably 20 and definitely less than 100. Q. Okay. How many times have you analyzed debris for the purpose of determining the level of soot or char in the debris? A. That would be more then 100, less than 200. Q. Okay. Are you the sole owner of N.G. Carlson Analytical, Inc.?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. Have you taught any courses on or portions of any courses on any topics related to wildfire analysis? A. No courses on wildfire analysis, sir. Q. Okay. I'll show you what we've marked as Exhibit 1. I believe this is a copy of your CV, correct? A. Yes, sir. That is. Q. All right. And can you just look through it and let me know if it's current? A. It's the most current one that I put together, yes. Q. Any additional seminars, publications, licenses, degrees that need to be added to this to make it complete? A. Well, let me look. Let me see if they have the one. I think the one that might be relevant to this case is that I reviewed a webinar, although I did not attend it. It was on smoke and soot analysis, from EMLab P&K. So I don't know if that one's listed here, but I think that would be the relevant one. Q. Okay. A. There are probably other ones, but I don't think they'd be relevant to this case. Q. Can you point me to aspects of your CV that are that	A. Does that clarify? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Yes, it does. Do you know how many how many cases you've been involved in or analyzed involving claims that wildfire debris has caused damage to property? A. I wouldn't know the exact one because when I get the reports it doesn't specify whether it was a building fire. So an internal source or an external source wildfire. So I couldn't give you a precise number on that. I can give you a range, if that would be helpful. Q. Sure. A. I would say more than probably 20 and definitely less than 100. Q. Okay. How many times have you analyzed debris for the purpose of determining the level of soot or char in the debris? A. That would be more then 100, less than 200. Q. Okay. Are you the sole owner of N.G. Carlson Analytical, Inc.? A. Yes, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. Have you taught any courses on or portions of any courses on any topics related to wildfire analysis? A. No courses on wildfire analysis, sir. Q. Okay. I'll show you what we've marked as Exhibit 1. I believe this is a copy of your CV, correct? A. Yes, sir. That is. Q. All right. And can you just look through it and let me know if it's current? A. It's the most current one that I put together, yes. Q. Any additional seminars, publications, licenses, degrees that need to be added to this to make it complete? A. Well, let me look. Let me see if they have the one. I think the one that might be relevant to this case is that I reviewed a webinar, although I did not attend it. It was on smoke and soot analysis, from EMLab P&K. So I don't know if that one's listed here, but I think that would be the relevant one. Q. Okay. A. There are probably other ones, but I don't think they'd be relevant to this case. Q. Can you point me to aspects of your CV that are that you consider relevant to wildfire analysis?	A. Does that clarify? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Yes, it does. Do you know how many how many cases you've been involved in or analyzed involving claims that wildfire debris has caused damage to property? A. I wouldn't know the exact one because when I get the reports it doesn't specify whether it was a building fire. So an internal source or an external source wildfire. So I couldn't give you a precise number on that. I can give you a range, if that would be helpful. Q. Sure. A. I would say more than probably 20 and definitely less than 100. Q. Okay. How many times have you analyzed debris for the purpose of determining the level of soot or char in the debris? A. That would be more then 100, less than 200. Q. Okay. Are you the sole owner of N.G. Carlson Analytical, Inc.? A. Yes, sir. Q. Okay. And how long has that company been in existence?

	Page 10	Page 12
1	A. So I will make sure I get an accurate accurate date	1 Q. Okay
2	on that. Let's see here.	2 A. Is that helpful?
3	O. And just, for the record, what are you looking at?	3 Q. Yeah. So with respect to all of your work
4	A. I'm looking at sorry. Thank you, sir. I am looking	4 A. Mm-hmm.
5	at my CV.	5 Q whether it's related to mold spores or related to
6	Q. Oh, okay.	6 soot and char analysis, can you tell me what percentage
7	A. Thank you for asking that. If you don't mind, sir, I	7 of your work comes from personal homeowners who ask you
8	have taken a photo of that particular piece of	8 directly to analyze some sort of
9	information on my cell phone, and I can refer to that to	9 A. Yeah.
10	give you a correct date. Would that be acceptable to	10 Q substance?
11	you?	11 A. I would say homeowners are represent it varies
12	Q. Well, has the company been around for more than 10	annually, but definitely represent less than 25 percent.
13	years?	13 Q. Okay And then how about FBS?
14	A. Yes. It was approximately and the date is	14 A. It varies each year. I would say probably around
15	approximately '96.	15 roughly 40 percent. It varies. Forty, 40 to
16	Q. Okay. And what does N.G. Carlson Analytical do?	16 50 percent.
17	A. N.G. Carlson Analytical does fungal fungal spore	17 Q. And when you say FBS, you're talking about Forensic
18	analysis. I've also done ergonomic analysis, although	18 Building Sciences, correct?
19	that's not my primary work. Indoor air quality	19 A. Yes, sir. Forensic Building Sciences.
20	assessments. I'll do home assessments for indoor air	20 Q. That's Tom Irmiter's company?
21	quality, both viable, nonviable fungal spore analysis.	21 A. That's correct. Yes, sir.
22	And then I'll do particulate analysis with respect to	22 Q, Then what does PCG stand for?
23	soot, char analysis, and that started September of 2	23 A. I would have to look that up. I'm not sure. I've just
24	2011 is when we started doing that.	24 seen PCG, and it's a I believe it's a it looks
25	Q. Okay. About what percentage of your work in the last	25 like a law firm or something like that, and they have
		D 12
	Page 11	Page 13
1	Page 11	Page 13 they do primarily work with fire cases, and they also do
1 2		
	year has involved analysis of fire debris as opposed to	1 they do primarily work with fire cases, and they also do
2	year has involved analysis of fire debris as opposed to analysis for fungal spores?	they do primarily work with fire cases, and they also do some work that apparently runs into some mold issues.
2	year has involved analysis of fire debris as opposed to analysis for fungal spores? A. I'm going to give you a rough estimate in a range. I	they do primarily work with fire cases, and they also do some work that apparently runs into some mold issues. Q. Okay. Do personal homeowners, have they ever contacted
2 3 4	year has involved analysis of fire debris as opposed to analysis for fungal spores? A. I'm going to give you a rough estimate in a range. I would say probably because some of it is actually	they do primarily work with fire cases, and they also do some work that apparently runs into some mold issues. Q. Okay. Do personal homeowners, have they ever contacted you directly to analyze fire debris, or is that more the
2 3 4 5	year has involved analysis of fire debris as opposed to analysis for fungal spores? A. I'm going to give you a rough estimate in a range. I would say probably because some of it is actually mixed. So it's going to be a little difficult, and I	they do primarily work with fire cases, and they also do some work that apparently runs into some mold issues. Q. Okay. Do personal homeowners, have they ever contacted you directly to analyze fire debris, or is that more the mold issues?
2 3 4 5	year has involved analysis of fire debris as opposed to analysis for fungal spores? A. I'm going to give you a rough estimate in a range. I would say probably because some of it is actually mixed. So it's going to be a little difficult, and I actually do both on a dataset, but, if you count both, I	they do primarily work with fire cases, and they also do some work that apparently runs into some mold issues. Q. Okay. Do personal homeowners, have they ever contacted you directly to analyze fire debris, or is that more the mold issues? A. I'm trying to think if anyone's ever done that. I think primarily the personal homeowners are are fungal. Q. Okay. And how about in terms of the work that you said
2 3 4 5 6 7	year has involved analysis of fire debris as opposed to analysis for fungal spores? A. I'm going to give you a rough estimate in a range. I would say probably because some of it is actually mixed. So it's going to be a little difficult, and I actually do both on a dataset, but, if you count both, I would say between probably 50 and 75 percent. Q. Okay, Can you give me examples of the types of people or entities that hire N.G. Carlson Analytical?	they do primarily work with fire cases, and they also do some work that apparently runs into some mold issues. Q. Okay. Do personal homeowners, have they ever contacted you directly to analyze fire debris, or is that more the mold issues? A. I'm trying to think if anyone's ever done that. I think primarily the personal homeowners are are fungal. Q. Okay. And how about in terms of the work that you said that 40 percent of your overall work comes from Forensic
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	year has involved analysis of fire debris as opposed to analysis for fungal spores? A. I'm going to give you a rough estimate in a range. I would say probably because some of it is actually mixed. So it's going to be a little difficult, and I actually do both on a dataset, but, if you count both, I would say between probably 50 and 75 percent. Q. Okay, Can you give me examples of the types of people or entities that hire N.G. Carlson Analytical? A. Sure. There's been primarily two companies that hire	they do primarily work with fire cases, and they also do some work that apparently runs into some mold issues. Q. Okay. Do personal homeowners, have they ever contacted you directly to analyze fire debris, or is that more the mold issues? A. I'm trying to think if anyone's ever done that. I think primarily the personal homeowners are are fungal. Q. Okay. And how about in terms of the work that you said that 40 percent of your overall work comes from Forensic Building Sciences? Is that a mix of fire debris and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	year has involved analysis of fire debris as opposed to analysis for fungal spores? A. I'm going to give you a rough estimate in a range. I would say probably because some of it is actually mixed. So it's going to be a little difficult, and I actually do both on a dataset, but, if you count both, I would say between probably 50 and 75 percent. Q. Okay, Can you give me examples of the types of people or entities that hire N.G. Carlson Analytical? A. Sure. There's been primarily two companies that hire it. And I'm assuming are you point of	they do primarily work with fire cases, and they also do some work that apparently runs into some mold issues. Q. Okay. Do personal homeowners, have they ever contacted you directly to analyze fire debris, or is that more the mold issues? A. I'm trying to think if anyone's ever done that. I think primarily the personal homeowners are are fungal. Q. Okay. And how about in terms of the work that you said that 40 percent of your overall work comes from Forensic Building Sciences? Is that a mix of fire debris and mold analysis?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	year has involved analysis of fire debris as opposed to analysis for fungal spores? A. I'm going to give you a rough estimate in a range. I would say probably because some of it is actually mixed. So it's going to be a little difficult, and I actually do both on a dataset, but, if you count both, I would say between probably 50 and 75 percent. Q. Okay, Can you give me examples of the types of people or entities that hire N.G. Carlson Analytical? A. Sure. There's been primarily two companies that hire it. And I'm assuming are you point of clarification, sir. Are you looking at primarily just	they do primarily work with fire cases, and they also do some work that apparently runs into some mold issues. Q. Okay. Do personal homeowners, have they ever contacted you directly to analyze fire debris, or is that more the mold issues? A. I'm trying to think if anyone's ever done that. I think primarily the personal homeowners are are fungal. Q. Okay. And how about in terms of the work that you said that 40 percent of your overall work comes from Forensic Building Sciences? Is that a mix of fire debris and mold analysis? A. Yes. Lately and that shifted. When I first started
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	year has involved analysis of fire debris as opposed to analysis for fungal spores? A. I'm going to give you a rough estimate in a range. I would say probably because some of it is actually mixed. So it's going to be a little difficult, and I actually do both on a dataset, but, if you count both, I would say between probably 50 and 75 percent. Q. Okay, Can you give me examples of the types of people or entities that hire N.G. Carlson Analytical? A. Sure. There's been primarily two companies that hire it. And I'm assuming are you point of clarification, sir. Are you looking at primarily just the soot and char, or are you looking at fungal, soot	they do primarily work with fire cases, and they also do some work that apparently runs into some mold issues. Q. Okay. Do personal homeowners, have they ever contacted you directly to analyze fire debris, or is that more the mold issues? A. I'm trying to think if anyone's ever done that. I think primarily the personal homeowners are are fungal. Q. Okay. And how about in terms of the work that you said that 40 percent of your overall work comes from Forensic Building Sciences? Is that a mix of fire debris and mold analysis? A. Yes. Lately and that shifted. When I first started out, it was prior to 2000, it was all mold analysis.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	year has involved analysis of fire debris as opposed to analysis for fungal spores? A. I'm going to give you a rough estimate in a range. I would say probably because some of it is actually mixed. So it's going to be a little difficult, and I actually do both on a dataset, but, if you count both, I would say between probably 50 and 75 percent. Q. Okay, Can you give me examples of the types of people or entities that hire N.G. Carlson Analytical? A. Sure. There's been primarily two companies that hire it. And I'm assuming are you point of clarification, sir. Are you looking at primarily just the soot and char, or are you looking at fungal, soot and char?	they do primarily work with fire cases, and they also do some work that apparently runs into some mold issues. Q. Okay. Do personal homeowners, have they ever contacted you directly to analyze fire debris, or is that more the mold issues? A. I'm trying to think if anyone's ever done that. I think primarily the personal homeowners are are fungal. Q. Okay. And how about in terms of the work that you said that 40 percent of your overall work comes from Forensic Building Sciences? Is that a mix of fire debris and mold analysis? A. Yes. Lately and that shifted. When I first started out, it was prior to 2000, it was all mold analysis. And then the percentage has shifted over to higher soot
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	year has involved analysis of fire debris as opposed to analysis for fungal spores? A. I'm going to give you a rough estimate in a range. I would say probably because some of it is actually mixed. So it's going to be a little difficult, and I actually do both on a dataset, but, if you count both, I would say between probably 50 and 75 percent. Q. Okay, Can you give me examples of the types of people or entities that hire N.G. Carlson Analytical? A. Sure. There's been primarily two companies that hire it. And I'm assuming are you point of clarification, sir. Are you looking at primarily just the soot and char, or are you looking at fungal, soot and char? Q. Everything.	they do primarily work with fire cases, and they also do some work that apparently runs into some mold issues. Q. Okay. Do personal homeowners, have they ever contacted you directly to analyze fire debris, or is that more the mold issues? A. I'm trying to think if anyone's ever done that. I think primarily the personal homeowners are are fungal. Q. Okay. And how about in terms of the work that you said that 40 percent of your overall work comes from Forensic Building Sciences? Is that a mix of fire debris and mold analysis? A. Yes. Lately and that shifted. When I first started out, it was prior to 2000, it was all mold analysis. And then the percentage has shifted over to higher soot and char analysis as we've progressed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	year has involved analysis of fire debris as opposed to analysis for fungal spores? A. I'm going to give you a rough estimate in a range. I would say probably because some of it is actually mixed. So it's going to be a little difficult, and I actually do both on a dataset, but, if you count both, I would say between probably 50 and 75 percent. Q. Okay, Can you give me examples of the types of people or entities that hire N.G. Carlson Analytical? A. Sure. There's been primarily two companies that hire it. And I'm assuming are you point of clarification, sir. Are you looking at primarily just the soot and char, or are you looking at fungal, soot and char? Q. Everything. A. Everything. Okay. The first one would be personal	they do primarily work with fire cases, and they also do some work that apparently runs into some mold issues. Q. Okay. Do personal homeowners, have they ever contacted you directly to analyze fire debris, or is that more the mold issues? A. I'm trying to think if anyone's ever done that. I think primarily the personal homeowners are are fungal. Q. Okay. And how about in terms of the work that you said that 40 percent of your overall work comes from Forensic Building Sciences? Is that a mix of fire debris and mold analysis? A. Yes. Lately and that shifted. When I first started out, it was prior to 2000, it was all mold analysis. And then the percentage has shifted over to higher soot and char analysis as we've progressed. Q. Have you ever done a soot and char analysis for anyone
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	year has involved analysis of fire debris as opposed to analysis for fungal spores? A. I'm going to give you a rough estimate in a range. I would say probably because some of it is actually mixed. So it's going to be a little difficult, and I actually do both on a dataset, but, if you count both, I would say between probably 50 and 75 percent. Q. Okay, Can you give me examples of the types of people or entities that hire N.G. Carlson Analytical? A. Sure. There's been primarily two companies that hire it. And I'm assuming are you point of clarification, sir. Are you looking at primarily just the soot and char, or are you looking at fungal, soot and char? Q. Everything. A. Everything. Okay. The first one would be personal homeowners that and there would be a wide variety of	they do primarily work with fire cases, and they also do some work that apparently runs into some mold issues. Q. Okay. Do personal homeowners, have they ever contacted you directly to analyze fire debris, or is that more the mold issues? A. I'm trying to think if anyone's ever done that. I think primarily the personal homeowners are are fungal. Q. Okay. And how about in terms of the work that you said that 40 percent of your overall work comes from Forensic Building Sciences? Is that a mix of fire debris and mold analysis? A. Yes. Lately and that shifted. When I first started out, it was prior to 2000, it was all mold analysis. And then the percentage has shifted over to higher soot and char analysis as we've progressed. Q. Have you ever done a soot and char analysis for anyone other than FBS?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	year has involved analysis of fire debris as opposed to analysis for fungal spores? A. I'm going to give you a rough estimate in a range. I would say probably because some of it is actually mixed. So it's going to be a little difficult, and I actually do both on a dataset, but, if you count both, I would say between probably 50 and 75 percent. Q. Okay, Can you give me examples of the types of people or entities that hire N.G. Carlson Analytical? A. Sure. There's been primarily two companies that hire it. And I'm assuming are you point of clarification, sir. Are you looking at primarily just the soot and char, or are you looking at fungal, soot and char? Q. Everything. A. Everything. Okay. The first one would be personal homeowners that and there would be a wide variety of them that would call and just say I've got a mold	they do primarily work with fire cases, and they also do some work that apparently runs into some mold issues. Q. Okay. Do personal homeowners, have they ever contacted you directly to analyze fire debris, or is that more the mold issues? A. I'm trying to think if anyone's ever done that. I think primarily the personal homeowners are are fungal. Q. Okay. And how about in terms of the work that you said that 40 percent of your overall work comes from Forensic Building Sciences? Is that a mix of fire debris and mold analysis? A. Yes. Lately and that shifted. When I first started out, it was prior to 2000, it was all mold analysis. And then the percentage has shifted over to higher soot and char analysis as we've progressed. Q. Have you ever done a soot and char analysis for anyone other than FBS? A. Yes. The PCG would be one, and then there's a there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	year has involved analysis of fire debris as opposed to analysis for fungal spores? A. I'm going to give you a rough estimate in a range. I would say probably because some of it is actually mixed. So it's going to be a little difficult, and I actually do both on a dataset, but, if you count both, I would say between probably 50 and 75 percent. Q. Okay, Can you give me examples of the types of people or entities that hire N.G. Carlson Analytical? A. Sure. There's been primarily two companies that hire it. And I'm assuming are you point of clarification, sir. Are you looking at primarily just the soot and char, or are you looking at fungal, soot and char? Q. Everything. A. Everything. Okay. The first one would be personal homeowners that and there would be a wide variety of them that would call and just say I've got a mold problem and I need somebody to take a look at it about.	they do primarily work with fire cases, and they also do some work that apparently runs into some mold issues. Q. Okay. Do personal homeowners, have they ever contacted you directly to analyze fire debris, or is that more the mold issues? A. I'm trying to think if anyone's ever done that. I think primarily the personal homeowners are are fungal. Q. Okay. And how about in terms of the work that you said that 40 percent of your overall work comes from Forensic Building Sciences? Is that a mix of fire debris and mold analysis? A. Yes. Lately and that shifted. When I first started out, it was prior to 2000, it was all mold analysis. And then the percentage has shifted over to higher soot and char analysis as we've progressed. Q. Have you ever done a soot and char analysis for anyone other than FBS? A. Yes. The PCG would be one, and then there's a there was another company who just sent me one I can't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	year has involved analysis of fire debris as opposed to analysis for fungal spores? A. I'm going to give you a rough estimate in a range. I would say probably because some of it is actually mixed. So it's going to be a little difficult, and I actually do both on a dataset, but, if you count both, I would say between probably 50 and 75 percent. Q. Okay, Can you give me examples of the types of people or entities that hire N.G. Carlson Analytical? A. Sure. There's been primarily two companies that hire it. And I'm assuming are you point of clarification, sir. Are you looking at primarily just the soot and char, or are you looking at fungal, soot and char? Q. Everything. A. Everything. Okay. The first one would be personal homeowners that and there would be a wide variety of them that would call and just say I've got a mold problem and I need somebody to take a look at it about. The second one would be FBS, and then there's also a	they do primarily work with fire cases, and they also do some work that apparently runs into some mold issues. Q. Okay. Do personal homeowners, have they ever contacted you directly to analyze fire debris, or is that more the mold issues? A. I'm trying to think if anyone's ever done that. I think primarily the personal homeowners are are fungal. Q. Okay. And how about in terms of the work that you said that 40 percent of your overall work comes from Forensic Building Sciences? Is that a mix of fire debris and mold analysis? A. Yes. Lately and that shifted. When I first started out, it was prior to 2000, it was all mold analysis. And then the percentage has shifted over to higher soot and char analysis as we've progressed. Q. Have you ever done a soot and char analysis for anyone other than FBS? A. Yes. The PCG would be one, and then there's a there was another company who just sent me one I can't recall their name just recently. And I there's a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	year has involved analysis of fire debris as opposed to analysis for fungal spores? A. I'm going to give you a rough estimate in a range. I would say probably because some of it is actually mixed. So it's going to be a little difficult, and I actually do both on a dataset, but, if you count both, I would say between probably 50 and 75 percent. Q. Okay, Can you give me examples of the types of people or entities that hire N.G. Carlson Analytical? A. Sure. There's been primarily two companies that hire it. And I'm assuming are you point of clarification, sir. Are you looking at primarily just the soot and char, or are you looking at fungal, soot and char? Q. Everything. A. Everything. Okay. The first one would be personal homeowners that and there would be a wide variety of them that would call and just say I've got a mold problem and I need somebody to take a look at it about. The second one would be FBS, and then there's also a company, PCG, I believe, that has also had me do work.	they do primarily work with fire cases, and they also do some work that apparently runs into some mold issues. Q. Okay. Do personal homeowners, have they ever contacted you directly to analyze fire debris, or is that more the mold issues? A. I'm trying to think if anyone's ever done that. I think primarily the personal homeowners are are fungal. Q. Okay. And how about in terms of the work that you said that 40 percent of your overall work comes from Forensic Building Sciences? Is that a mix of fire debris and mold analysis? A. Yes. Lately and that shifted. When I first started out, it was prior to 2000, it was all mold analysis. And then the percentage has shifted over to higher soot and char analysis as we've progressed. Q. Have you ever done a soot and char analysis for anyone other than FBS? A. Yes. The PCG would be one, and then there's a there was another company who just sent me one I can't recall their name just recently. And I there's a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	year has involved analysis of fire debris as opposed to analysis for fungal spores? A. I'm going to give you a rough estimate in a range. I would say probably because some of it is actually mixed. So it's going to be a little difficult, and I actually do both on a dataset, but, if you count both, I would say between probably 50 and 75 percent. Q. Okay. Can you give me examples of the types of people or entities that hire N.G. Carlson Analytical? A. Sure. There's been primarily two companies that hire it. And I'm assuming are you point of clarification, sir. Are you looking at primarily just the soot and char, or are you looking at fungal, soot and char? Q. Everything. A. Everything. Okay. The first one would be personal homeowners that and there would be a wide variety of them that would call and just say I've got a mold problem and I need somebody to take a look at it about. The second one would be FBS, and then there's also a company, PCG, I believe, that has also had me do work. There are a couple other companies. Their names escape	they do primarily work with fire cases, and they also do some work that apparently runs into some mold issues. Q. Okay. Do personal homeowners, have they ever contacted you directly to analyze fire debris, or is that more the mold issues? A. I'm trying to think if anyone's ever done that. I think primarily the personal homeowners are are fungal. Q. Okay. And how about in terms of the work that you said that 40 percent of your overall work comes from Forensic Building Sciences? Is that a mix of fire debris and mold analysis? A. Yes. Lately and that shifted. When I first started out, it was prior to 2000, it was all mold analysis. And then the percentage has shifted over to higher soot and char analysis as we've progressed. Q. Have you ever done a soot and char analysis for anyone other than FBS? A. Yes. The PCG would be one, and then there's a there was another company who just sent me one I can't recall their name just recently. And I there's a couple other companies, and I don't remember. I've only done, I would say less than 10 percent business, but I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	year has involved analysis of fire debris as opposed to analysis for fungal spores? A. I'm going to give you a rough estimate in a range. I would say probably because some of it is actually mixed. So it's going to be a little difficult, and I actually do both on a dataset, but, if you count both, I would say between probably 50 and 75 percent. Q. Okay. Can you give me examples of the types of people or entities that hire N.G. Carlson Analytical? A. Sure. There's been primarily two companies that hire it. And I'm assuming are you point of clarification, sir. Are you looking at primarily just the soot and char, or are you looking at fungal, soot and char? Q. Everything. A. Everything. Okay. The first one would be personal homeowners that and there would be a wide variety of them that would call and just say I've got a mold problem and I need somebody to take a look at it about. The second one would be FBS, and then there's also a company, PCG, I believe, that has also had me do work. There are a couple other companies. Their names escape me, but they're similar, similar structure to what PCG	they do primarily work with fire cases, and they also do some work that apparently runs into some mold issues. Q. Okay. Do personal homeowners, have they ever contacted you directly to analyze fire debris, or is that more the mold issues? A. I'm trying to think if anyone's ever done that. I think primarily the personal homeowners are are fungal. Q. Okay. And how about in terms of the work that you said that 40 percent of your overall work comes from Forensic Building Sciences? Is that a mix of fire debris and mold analysis? A. Yes. Lately and that shifted. When I first started out, it was prior to 2000, it was all mold analysis. And then the percentage has shifted over to higher soot and char analysis as we've progressed. Q. Have you ever done a soot and char analysis for anyone other than FBS? A. Yes. The PCG would be one, and then there's a there was another company who just sent me one I can't recall their name just recently. And I there's a couple other companies, and I don't remember. I've only done, I would say less than 10 percent business, but I can't recall their names.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	year has involved analysis of fire debris as opposed to analysis for fungal spores? A. I'm going to give you a rough estimate in a range. I would say probably because some of it is actually mixed. So it's going to be a little difficult, and I actually do both on a dataset, but, if you count both, I would say between probably 50 and 75 percent. Q. Okay. Can you give me examples of the types of people or entities that hire N.G. Carlson Analytical? A. Sure. There's been primarily two companies that hire it. And I'm assuming are you point of clarification, sir. Are you looking at primarily just the soot and char, or are you looking at fungal, soot and char? Q. Everything. A. Everything. Okay. The first one would be personal homeowners that and there would be a wide variety of them that would call and just say I've got a mold problem and I need somebody to take a look at it about. The second one would be FBS, and then there's also a company, PCG, I believe, that has also had me do work. There are a couple other companies. Their names escape	they do primarily work with fire cases, and they also do some work that apparently runs into some mold issues. Q. Okay. Do personal homeowners, have they ever contacted you directly to analyze fire debris, or is that more the mold issues? A. I'm trying to think if anyone's ever done that. I think primarily the personal homeowners are are fungal. Q. Okay. And how about in terms of the work that you said that 40 percent of your overall work comes from Forensic Building Sciences? Is that a mix of fire debris and mold analysis? A. Yes. Lately and that shifted. When I first started out, it was prior to 2000, it was all mold analysis. And then the percentage has shifted over to higher soot and char analysis as we've progressed. Q. Have you ever done a soot and char analysis for anyone other than FBS? A. Yes. The PCG would be one, and then there's a there was another company who just sent me one I can't recall their name just recently. And I there's a couple other companies, and I don't remember. I've only done, I would say less than 10 percent business, but I

	Page 14		Page 16
1	Q. Okay	1 2	that I use on that one, and the and the name of the
2	A. Or I do not know, or I do not recall. O. About how many times have you analyzed debris for	3	scope that I have is escaping me. It's essentially a light microscope. I don't recall the brand for the one
3		4	
4	Forensic Building Sciences, whether it be for mold or	5	at home. And then I have 4X, 10X, 20X, 40X and 60X that I use for analysis, and it's a light, both are light
5	for soot and char?	6	microscopy.
6	A. That's a I I don't recall for sure. I can give	7	Q. Okay. Do you have any equipment that can go beyond 60x?
7 8	you a range that it's let's see. It would be more	8	A. I can, but I don't use that typically. There's an oil
	than definitely more than 200, probably less than 600.	9	immersion setting, and I typically don't go don't go
9	Q. Okay.	10	to that.
	A. Just to make sure I'm accurate.	11	Q. Okay. So do you have any other equipment that you
11	Q. Somewhere in there?	12	consider part of the laboratory?
12	A. Somewhere in that range	13	MR_SCOTT: Object to the form.
13 14	Q. All right.	14	A, I I don't understand
15	A sounds good.	15	Q. (MR. DEVELLING) Sure.
16	O. Do you know how many times you've analyzed soot and char	16	A exactly what you're you're talking about.
17	for FBS?	17	Q. Sure. Do you have any other equipment that you use to
18	A. It would be I'm going to guess it's well, I don't	18	analyze debris samples, other than those two
19	want to say guess because I was attempting to determine	19	microscopes?
20	that before, looking through, and my emails didn't go	20	A. Well, let's just say I'll to maybe help clarify, I
21	back to when I started as far as doing a count. So it	21	use microscope slides. I use mounting fluids. I use
22	is more than 50 but less than probably 150, at my best	22	coverslips. I use a 3M red tartan Scotch tape. Let's
23	estimate.	23	see if there's anything else. I may use something to
24	Q. Okay. When you get a well, when FBS sends you a	24	break a sample up a little bit if it's too compact, some
25	sample they want analyzed, how does that communication	25	mechanical piece. Tweezers. That I think that would
	Page 15	1	6 47
	rage 13		Page 17
1	happen? Is it by email or phone or what?	1	Page 17
1 2	_	1 2	
	happen? Is it by email or phone or what?		approximately be it.
2	happen? Is it by email or phone or what? A. It can come several different ways. Primarily,	2	approximately be it. Q. Okay. Do you have any equipment that's capable of doing
2	happen? Is it by email or phone or what? A. It can come several different ways. Primarily, sometimes I will just get a package without any email	2	approximately be it. Q. Okay. Do you have any equipment that's capable of doing an elemental analysis of any debris?
2 3 4	happen? Is it by email or phone or what? A. It can come several different ways. Primarily, sometimes I will just get a package without any email communication, and then I will do the analysis.	2 3 4	approximately be it. Q. Okay. Do you have any equipment that's capable of doing an elemental analysis of any debris? A. I don't as you asked it, I'm not doing anything other
2 3 4 5	happen? Is it by email or phone or what? A. It can come several different ways. Primarily, sometimes I will just get a package without any email communication, and then I will do the analysis. Sometimes I will get a a phone call just saying are	2 3 4 5	approximately be it. Q. Okay. Do you have any equipment that's capable of doing an elemental analysis of any debris? A. I don't as you asked it, I'm not doing anything other than visual light microscopy analysis. I'm not doing a
2 3 4 5 6	happen? Is it by email or phone or what? A. It can come several different ways. Primarily, sometimes I will just get a package without any email communication, and then I will do the analysis. Sometimes I will get a a phone call just saying are you available, we have samples coming. Not often that	2 3 4 5	approximately be it. Q. Okay. Do you have any equipment that's capable of doing an elemental analysis of any debris? A. I don't as you asked it, I'm not doing anything other than visual light microscopy analysis. I'm not doing a chemical analysis. Was that what you were asking?
2 3 4 5 6 7	happen? Is it by email or phone or what? A. It can come several different ways. Primarily, sometimes I will just get a package without any email communication, and then I will do the analysis. Sometimes I will get a a phone call just saying are you available, we have samples coming. Not often that I'll get an email notification of the way maybe	2 3 4 5 6 7	approximately be it. Q. Okay. Do you have any equipment that's capable of doing an elemental analysis of any debris? A. I don't as you asked it, I'm not doing anything other than visual light microscopy analysis. I'm not doing a chemical analysis. Was that what you were asking? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Well, actually, what I want to know, if you have any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	happen? Is it by email or phone or what? A. It can come several different ways. Primarily, sometimes I will just get a package without any email communication, and then I will do the analysis. Sometimes I will get a a phone call just saying are you available, we have samples coming. Not often that I'll get an email notification of the way maybe sometimes I will. In this case, as far as when I look	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	approximately be it. Q. Okay. Do you have any equipment that's capable of doing an elemental analysis of any debris? A. I don't as you asked it, I'm not doing anything other than visual light microscopy analysis. I'm not doing a chemical analysis. Was that what you were asking? Q. Yes. A. Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	happen? Is it by email or phone or what? A. It can come several different ways. Primarily, sometimes I will just get a package without any email communication, and then I will do the analysis. Sometimes I will get a a phone call just saying are you available, we have samples coming. Not often that I'll get an email notification of the way maybe sometimes I will. In this case, as far as when I look through the email chains, I didn't see an email coming	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	approximately be it. Q. Okay. Do you have any equipment that's capable of doing an elemental analysis of any debris? A. I don't as you asked it, I'm not doing anything other than visual light microscopy analysis. I'm not doing a chemical analysis. Was that what you were asking? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Well, actually, what I want to know, if you have any equipment capable of doing a chemical analysis. A. No, I do not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	happen? Is it by email or phone or what? A. It can come several different ways. Primarily, sometimes I will just get a package without any email communication, and then I will do the analysis. Sometimes I will get a a phone call just saying are you available, we have samples coming. Not often that I'll get an email notification of the way maybe sometimes I will. In this case, as far as when I look through the email chains, I didn't see an email coming beforehand. Q. Okay. Can you describe just if I well, first of all, where is your lab located?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	approximately be it. Q. Okay. Do you have any equipment that's capable of doing an elemental analysis of any debris? A. I don't as you asked it, I'm not doing anything other than visual light microscopy analysis. I'm not doing a chemical analysis. Was that what you were asking? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Well, actually, what I want to know, if you have any equipment capable of doing a chemical analysis. A. No, I do not. Q. Okay. Would you know how to run a test to determine the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	happen? Is it by email or phone or what? A. It can come several different ways. Primarily, sometimes I will just get a package without any email communication, and then I will do the analysis. Sometimes I will get a a phone call just saying are you available, we have samples coming. Not often that I'll get an email notification of the way maybe sometimes I will. In this case, as far as when I look through the email chains, I didn't see an email coming beforehand. Q. Okay. Can you describe just if I well, first of all, where is your lab located? A. I do my analysis at two locations. One is I have a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	approximately be it. Q. Okay. Do you have any equipment that's capable of doing an elemental analysis of any debris? A. I don't as you asked it, I'm not doing anything other than visual light microscopy analysis. I'm not doing a chemical analysis. Was that what you were asking? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Well, actually, what I want to know, if you have any equipment capable of doing a chemical analysis. A. No, I do not. Q. Okay. Would you know how to run a test to determine the elemental composition of any particulate material?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	happen? Is it by email or phone or what? A. It can come several different ways. Primarily, sometimes I will just get a package without any email communication, and then I will do the analysis. Sometimes I will get a a phone call just saying are you available, we have samples coming. Not often that I'll get an email notification of the way maybe sometimes I will. In this case, as far as when I look through the email chains, I didn't see an email coming beforehand. Q. Okay. Can you describe just if I well, first of all, where is your lab located? A. I do my analysis at two locations. One is I have a microscope set up in my home, in my residence. Do you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	approximately be it. Q. Okay. Do you have any equipment that's capable of doing an elemental analysis of any debris? A. I don't as you asked it, I'm not doing anything other than visual light microscopy analysis. I'm not doing a chemical analysis. Was that what you were asking? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Well, actually, what I want to know, if you have any equipment capable of doing a chemical analysis. A. No, I do not. Q. Okay. Would you know how to run a test to determine the elemental composition of any particulate material? A. No. That's not the type of analysis that I'm doing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	happen? Is it by email or phone or what? A. It can come several different ways. Primarily, sometimes I will just get a package without any email communication, and then I will do the analysis. Sometimes I will get a a phone call just saying are you available, we have samples coming. Not often that I'll get an email notification of the way maybe sometimes I will. In this case, as far as when I look through the email chains, I didn't see an email coming beforehand. Q. Okay. Can you describe just if I well, first of all, where is your lab located? A. I do my analysis at two locations. One is I have a microscope set up in my home, in my residence. Do you need the address of that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	approximately be it. Q. Okay. Do you have any equipment that's capable of doing an elemental analysis of any debris? A. I don't as you asked it, I'm not doing anything other than visual light microscopy analysis. I'm not doing a chemical analysis. Was that what you were asking? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Well, actually, what I want to know, if you have any equipment capable of doing a chemical analysis. A. No, I do not. Q. Okay. Would you know how to run a test to determine the elemental composition of any particulate material? A. No. That's not the type of analysis that I'm doing. Q. Okay. And are you trained to do that analysis?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	happen? Is it by email or phone or what? A. It can come several different ways. Primarily, sometimes I will just get a package without any email communication, and then I will do the analysis. Sometimes I will get a a phone call just saying are you available, we have samples coming. Not often that I'll get an email notification of the way maybe sometimes I will. In this case, as far as when I look through the email chains, I didn't see an email coming beforehand. Q. Okay. Can you describe just if I well, first of all, where is your lab located? A. I do my analysis at two locations. One is I have a microscope set up in my home, in my residence. Do you need the address of that? Q. No, I don't need the address.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	approximately be it. Q. Okay. Do you have any equipment that's capable of doing an elemental analysis of any debris? A. I don't as you asked it, I'm not doing anything other than visual light microscopy analysis. I'm not doing a chemical analysis. Was that what you were asking? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Well, actually, what I want to know, if you have any equipment capable of doing a chemical analysis. A. No, I do not. Q. Okay. Would you know how to run a test to determine the elemental composition of any particulate material? A. No. That's not the type of analysis that I'm doing. Q. Okay. And are you trained to do that analysis? A. To do the chemical analysis, no.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	happen? Is it by email or phone or what? A. It can come several different ways. Primarily, sometimes I will just get a package without any email communication, and then I will do the analysis. Sometimes I will get a a phone call just saying are you available, we have samples coming. Not often that I'll get an email notification of the way maybe sometimes I will. In this case, as far as when I look through the email chains, I didn't see an email coming beforehand. Q. Okay. Can you describe just if I well, first of all, where is your lab located? A. I do my analysis at two locations. One is I have a microscope set up in my home, in my residence. Do you need the address of that? Q. No, I don't need the address. A. Okay. All right. So I have a lab set up in my home.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	approximately be it. Q. Okay. Do you have any equipment that's capable of doing an elemental analysis of any debris? A. I don't as you asked it, I'm not doing anything other than visual light microscopy analysis. I'm not doing a chemical analysis. Was that what you were asking? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Well, actually, what I want to know, if you have any equipment capable of doing a chemical analysis. A. No, I do not. Q. Okay. Would you know how to run a test to determine the elemental composition of any particulate material? A. No. That's not the type of analysis that I'm doing. Q. Okay. And are you trained to do that analysis? A. To do the chemical analysis, no. Q. All right. I've heard the certain laboratories
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	happen? Is it by email or phone or what? A. It can come several different ways. Primarily, sometimes I will just get a package without any email communication, and then I will do the analysis. Sometimes I will get a a phone call just saying are you available, we have samples coming. Not often that I'll get an email notification of the way maybe sometimes I will. In this case, as far as when I look through the email chains, I didn't see an email coming beforehand. Q. Okay. Can you describe just if I well, first of all, where is your lab located? A. I do my analysis at two locations. One is I have a microscope set up in my home, in my residence. Do you need the address of that? Q. No, I don't need the address. A. Okay. All right. So I have a lab set up in my home. And then I also use a microscope that I have available	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	approximately be it. Q. Okay. Do you have any equipment that's capable of doing an elemental analysis of any debris? A. I don't as you asked it, I'm not doing anything other than visual light microscopy analysis. I'm not doing a chemical analysis. Was that what you were asking? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Well, actually, what I want to know, if you have any equipment capable of doing a chemical analysis. A. No, I do not. Q. Okay. Would you know how to run a test to determine the elemental composition of any particulate material? A. No. That's not the type of analysis that I'm doing. Q. Okay. And are you trained to do that analysis? A. To do the chemical analysis, no. Q. All right. I've heard the certain laboratories described as Level 1 laboratories and also Level 4
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	happen? Is it by email or phone or what? A. It can come several different ways. Primarily, sometimes I will just get a package without any email communication, and then I will do the analysis. Sometimes I will get a a phone call just saying are you available, we have samples coming. Not often that I'll get an email notification of the way maybe sometimes I will. In this case, as far as when I look through the email chains, I didn't see an email coming beforehand. Q. Okay. Can you describe just if I well, first of all, where is your lab located? A. I do my analysis at two locations. One is I have a microscope set up in my home, in my residence. Do you need the address of that? Q. No, I don't need the address. A. Okay. All right. So I have a lab set up in my home. And then I also use a microscope that I have available at the lab at the University of Minnesota.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	approximately be it. Q. Okay. Do you have any equipment that's capable of doing an elemental analysis of any debris? A. I don't as you asked it, I'm not doing anything other than visual light microscopy analysis. I'm not doing a chemical analysis. Was that what you were asking? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Well, actually, what I want to know, if you have any equipment capable of doing a chemical analysis. A. No, I do not. Q. Okay. Would you know how to run a test to determine the elemental composition of any particulate material? A. No. That's not the type of analysis that I'm doing. Q. Okay. And are you trained to do that analysis? A. To do the chemical analysis, no. Q. All right. I've heard the certain laboratories described as Level 1 laboratories and also Level 4 laboratories. Are you familiar with that distinction?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	happen? Is it by email or phone or what? A. It can come several different ways. Primarily, sometimes I will just get a package without any email communication, and then I will do the analysis. Sometimes I will get a a phone call just saying are you available, we have samples coming. Not often that I'll get an email notification of the way maybe sometimes I will. In this case, as far as when I look through the email chains, I didn't see an email coming beforehand. Q. Okay. Can you describe just if I well, first of all, where is your lab located? A. I do my analysis at two locations. One is I have a microscope set up in my home, in my residence. Do you need the address of that? Q. No, I don't need the address. A. Okay. All right. So I have a lab set up in my home. And then I also use a microscope that I have available at the lab at the University of Minnesota. Q. All right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	approximately be it. Q. Okay. Do you have any equipment that's capable of doing an elemental analysis of any debris? A. I don't as you asked it, I'm not doing anything other than visual light microscopy analysis. I'm not doing a chemical analysis. Was that what you were asking? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Well, actually, what I want to know, if you have any equipment capable of doing a chemical analysis. A. No, I do not. Q. Okay. Would you know how to run a test to determine the elemental composition of any particulate material? A. No. That's not the type of analysis that I'm doing. Q. Okay. And are you trained to do that analysis? A. To do the chemical analysis, no. Q. All right. I've heard the certain laboratories described as Level 1 laboratories and also Level 4 laboratories. Are you familiar with that distinction? A. Yes, I am, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	happen? Is it by email or phone or what? A. It can come several different ways. Primarily, sometimes I will just get a package without any email communication, and then I will do the analysis. Sometimes I will get a a phone call just saying are you available, we have samples coming. Not often that I'll get an email notification of the way maybe sometimes I will. In this case, as far as when I look through the email chains, I didn't see an email coming beforehand. Q. Okay. Can you describe just if I well, first of all, where is your lab located? A. I do my analysis at two locations. One is I have a microscope set up in my home, in my residence. Do you need the address of that? Q. No, I don't need the address. A. Okay. All right. So I have a lab set up in my home. And then I also use a microscope that I have available at the lab at the University of Minnesota. Q. All right. A. But primarily most of the work is done at home.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	approximately be it. Q. Okay. Do you have any equipment that's capable of doing an elemental analysis of any debris? A. I don't as you asked it, I'm not doing anything other than visual light microscopy analysis. I'm not doing a chemical analysis. Was that what you were asking? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Well, actually, what I want to know, if you have any equipment capable of doing a chemical analysis. A. No, I do not. Q. Okay. Would you know how to run a test to determine the elemental composition of any particulate material? A. No. That's not the type of analysis that I'm doing. Q. Okay. And are you trained to do that analysis? A. To do the chemical analysis, no. Q. All right. I've heard the certain laboratories described as Level 1 laboratories and also Level 4 laboratories. Are you familiar with that distinction? A. Yes, I am, sir. Q. What's the difference between a Level 1 and a Level 4
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	happen? Is it by email or phone or what? A. It can come several different ways. Primarily, sometimes I will just get a package without any email communication, and then I will do the analysis. Sometimes I will get a a phone call just saying are you available, we have samples coming. Not often that I'll get an email notification of the way maybe sometimes I will. In this case, as far as when I look through the email chains, I didn't see an email coming beforehand. Q. Okay. Can you describe just if I well, first of all, where is your lab located? A. I do my analysis at two locations. One is I have a microscope set up in my home, in my residence. Do you need the address of that? Q. No, I don't need the address. A. Okay. All right. So I have a lab set up in my home. And then I also use a microscope that I have available at the lab at the University of Minnesota. Q. All right. A. But primarily most of the work is done at home. Q. What kind of microscope?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	approximately be it. Q. Okay. Do you have any equipment that's capable of doing an elemental analysis of any debris? A. I don't as you asked it, I'm not doing anything other than visual light microscopy analysis. I'm not doing a chemical analysis. Was that what you were asking? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Well, actually, what I want to know, if you have any equipment capable of doing a chemical analysis. A. No, I do not. Q. Okay. Would you know how to run a test to determine the elemental composition of any particulate material? A. No. That's not the type of analysis that I'm doing. Q. Okay. And are you trained to do that analysis? A. To do the chemical analysis, no. Q. All right. I've heard the certain laboratories described as Level 1 laboratories and also Level 4 laboratories. Are you familiar with that distinction? A. Yes, I am, sir. Q. What's the difference between a Level 1 and a Level 4 laboratory?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	happen? Is it by email or phone or what? A. It can come several different ways. Primarily, sometimes I will just get a package without any email communication, and then I will do the analysis. Sometimes I will get a a phone call just saying are you available, we have samples coming. Not often that I'll get an email notification of the way maybe sometimes I will. In this case, as far as when I look through the email chains, I didn't see an email coming beforehand. Q. Okay. Can you describe just if I well, first of all, where is your lab located? A. I do my analysis at two locations. One is I have a microscope set up in my home, in my residence. Do you need the address of that? Q. No, I don't need the address. A. Okay. All right. So I have a lab set up in my home. And then I also use a microscope that I have available at the lab at the University of Minnesota. Q. All right. A. But primarily most of the work is done at home. Q. What kind of microscope? A. It is the one at the lab is a it's a light	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	approximately be it. Q. Okay. Do you have any equipment that's capable of doing an elemental analysis of any debris? A. I don't as you asked it, I'm not doing anything other than visual light microscopy analysis. I'm not doing a chemical analysis. Was that what you were asking? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Well, actually, what I want to know, if you have any equipment capable of doing a chemical analysis. A. No, I do not. Q. Okay. Would you know how to run a test to determine the elemental composition of any particulate material? A. No. That's not the type of analysis that I'm doing. Q. Okay. And are you trained to do that analysis? A. To do the chemical analysis, no. Q. All right. I've heard the certain laboratories described as Level 1 laboratories and also Level 4 laboratories. Are you familiar with that distinction? A. Yes, I am, sir. Q. What's the difference between a Level 1 and a Level 4 laboratory? A. Well, Level 1 laboratory will be doing light microscopy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	happen? Is it by email or phone or what? A. It can come several different ways. Primarily, sometimes I will just get a package without any email communication, and then I will do the analysis. Sometimes I will get a a phone call just saying are you available, we have samples coming. Not often that I'll get an email notification of the way maybe sometimes I will. In this case, as far as when I look through the email chains, I didn't see an email coming beforehand. Q. Okay. Can you describe just if I well, first of all, where is your lab located? A. I do my analysis at two locations. One is I have a microscope set up in my home, in my residence. Do you need the address of that? Q. No, I don't need the address. A. Okay. All right. So I have a lab set up in my home. And then I also use a microscope that I have available at the lab at the University of Minnesota. Q. All right. A. But primarily most of the work is done at home. Q. What kind of microscope?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	approximately be it. Q. Okay. Do you have any equipment that's capable of doing an elemental analysis of any debris? A. I don't as you asked it, I'm not doing anything other than visual light microscopy analysis. I'm not doing a chemical analysis. Was that what you were asking? Q. Yes. A. Okay. Q. Well, actually, what I want to know, if you have any equipment capable of doing a chemical analysis. A. No, I do not. Q. Okay. Would you know how to run a test to determine the elemental composition of any particulate material? A. No. That's not the type of analysis that I'm doing. Q. Okay. And are you trained to do that analysis? A. To do the chemical analysis, no. Q. All right. I've heard the certain laboratories described as Level 1 laboratories and also Level 4 laboratories. Are you familiar with that distinction? A. Yes, I am, sir. Q. What's the difference between a Level 1 and a Level 4 laboratory?

	Page 18		Page 20
1	tease tape sample or bulk sample and look at it under	1	Q. Yeah, by all means.
2	the microscope, but there is no chemical analysis done	2	A. Let's see where there's the Days Inn. Yes, sir.
3	on a Level 1 as to chemical composition of it. There	3	Q. All right. So Exhibit 2 is a complete copy of your
4	isn't enhanced magnification through let's say electron	4	report with respect to the Days Inn, correct?
5	microscopy. There isn't any other specific chemical	5	A. Yes, sir.
6	analysis of of the different types of particles in	6	Q. And if you could look at Exhibit 3 and let me know if
7	there. So I did I did not do any of that.	7	that's a true and correct copy of your report with
8	O. Okay. Do you charge a flat fee for doing your Level 1	8	respect to the Rocky Waters Motor Inn.
9	microscopy analysis?	9	A. Yes, sir.
10	A. Yes. I have two separate flat fees. One is \$35 for	10	Q. All right. Now I forget the original question that
11	both fungal and soot and char analysis, and another one,	11	caused us to get those out.
12	if they need to have a rush sample, it's \$50 a sample.	12	A. Oh, we were I think, sir, we were trying to determine
13	Q. Oh, for rush?	13	if I gave any more interpretation of the analysis.
14	A. Yeah, for rush.	14	Q. Correct
15	Q. Okay.	15	A. Is that correct, sir?
16	A. Yeah.	16	Q. Yeah. Could you let me know if you did provide any
17	Q. Do you charge anything additional for drafting a report	17	additional interpretation beyond just the, you know,
18	of what you saw?	18	characterizing the results themselves?
19	A. No. The only additional charge I would is if if I	19	A. I think the only other interpretation would be in the
20	have to if they would like photographs included with	20	discussion session, and it would just give the range of
21	the report, I charge \$5 for photographs because it takes	21	of the relative concentration of the char-like and
22	some time to put the photos in the report, but I don't	22	soot-like particles in both in both of those. I also
23	charge for putting together a report for that analysis.	23	stated that they didn't do any chemical identification.
24	Now, if I am asked to comment on or give interpretation	24	So essentially stating that I'm not doing a Level 4
25	on the report, then I charge \$150 an hour to prepare	25	analysis.
			700
	Page 19		Page 21
1	that for just a straight one, nonlegal, but just a	1	Q. Okay
2	straight one.	2	A. I'm doing a Level 1.
3	Q. Okay. In this case, did you do any interpretation of	3	Q. Are there organizations that provide accreditation to
4	the results, or did you just provide FBS with the	4	laboratories?
5	with the results themselves?	5	
6	A. V. did-It do not controlled intermediation. About the		A. There are. I think the I participate in the ones
	A. I didn't do any extensive interpretation. About the	6	A. There are. I think the I participate in the ones that deal with fungal identification. I'm not I'm
7	only thing that would be construed as interpretation	6 7	
7 8			that deal with fungal identification. I'm not I'm
	only thing that would be construed as interpretation	7	that deal with fungal identification. I'm not I'm not cognizant of the specific one associated with the
8	only thing that would be construed as interpretation probably would be that I bolded some areas. Let me take	7	that deal with fungal identification. I'm not I'm not cognizant of the specific one associated with the Level 1 analysis.
8 9	only thing that would be construed as interpretation probably would be that I bolded some areas. Let me take a look at the re may I refer to the report, sir?	7 8 9	that deal with fungal identification. I'm not I'm not cognizant of the specific one associated with the Level 1 analysis. Q. All right. Is your laboratory accredited by anyone?
8 9 10	only thing that would be construed as interpretation probably would be that I bolded some areas. Let me take a look at the re may I refer to the report, sir? Q. Yeah. Why don't we do this.	7 8 9 10	that deal with fungal identification. I'm not I'm not cognizant of the specific one associated with the Level 1 analysis. Q. All right. Is your laboratory accredited by anyone? A. For for no, it is not.
8 9 10 11	only thing that would be construed as interpretation probably would be that I bolded some areas. Let me take a look at the re may I refer to the report, sir? Q. Yeah. Why don't we do this, A. Okay.	7 8 9 10	that deal with fungal identification. I'm not I'm not cognizant of the specific one associated with the Level 1 analysis. Q. All right. Is your laboratory accredited by anyone? A. For for no, it is not. Q. Okay. And is there any specific accreditation for
8 9 10 11 12	only thing that would be construed as interpretation probably would be that I bolded some areas. Let me take a look at the re may I refer to the report, sir? Q. Yeah. Why don't we do this. A. Okay. Q. I already marked color	7 8 9 10 11	that deal with fungal identification. I'm not I'm not cognizant of the specific one associated with the Level 1 analysis. Q. All right. Is your laboratory accredited by anyone? A. For for no, it is not. Q. Okay. And is there any specific accreditation for laboratories analyzing fire residue?
8 9 10 11 12 13	only thing that would be construed as interpretation probably would be that I bolded some areas. Let me take a look at the re may I refer to the report, sir? Q. Yeah. Why don't we do this. A. Okay. Q. I already marked color A. Okay.	7 8 9 10 11 12	that deal with fungal identification. I'm not I'm not cognizant of the specific one associated with the Level 1 analysis. Q. All right. Is your laboratory accredited by anyone? A. For for no, it is not. Q. Okay. And is there any specific accreditation for laboratories analyzing fire residue? A. I there may be. I'm I don't know.
8 9 10 11 12 13	only thing that would be construed as interpretation probably would be that I bolded some areas. Let me take a look at the re may I refer to the report, sir? Q. Yeah. Why don't we do this, A. Okay. Q. I already marked color A. Okay. Q copies of both reports as Exhibits 2 and 3.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that deal with fungal identification. I'm not I'm not cognizant of the specific one associated with the Level 1 analysis. Q. All right. Is your laboratory accredited by anyone? A. For for no, it is not. Q. Okay. And is there any specific accreditation for laboratories analyzing fire residue? A. I there may be. I'm I don't know. Q. Is there any specific accreditation, to your knowledge,
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	only thing that would be construed as interpretation probably would be that I bolded some areas. Let me take a look at the re may I refer to the report, sir? Q. Yeah. Why don't we do this, A. Okay. Q. I already marked color A. Okay. Q copies of both reports as Exhibits 2 and 3. A. Sure.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that deal with fungal identification. I'm not I'm not cognizant of the specific one associated with the Level 1 analysis. Q. All right. Is your laboratory accredited by anyone? A. For for no, it is not. Q. Okay. And is there any specific accreditation for laboratories analyzing fire residue? A. I there may be. I'm I don't know. Q. Is there any specific accreditation, to your knowledge, for laboratories analyzing fungal spores?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	only thing that would be construed as interpretation probably would be that I bolded some areas. Let me take a look at the re may I refer to the report, sir? Q. Yeah. Why don't we do this. A. Okay. Q. I already marked color A. Okay. Q copies of both reports as Exhibits 2 and 3. A. Sure. Q. This would probably be a good time for me to hand these	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that deal with fungal identification. I'm not I'm not cognizant of the specific one associated with the Level 1 analysis. Q. All right. Is your laboratory accredited by anyone? A. For for no, it is not. Q. Okay. And is there any specific accreditation for laboratories analyzing fire residue? A. I there may be. I'm I don't know. Q. Is there any specific accreditation, to your knowledge, for laboratories analyzing fungal spores? A. Yes, there is. The fungal spore accreditation is
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	only thing that would be construed as interpretation probably would be that I bolded some areas. Let me take a look at the re may I refer to the report, sir? Q. Yeah. Why don't we do this. A. Okay. Q. I already marked color A. Okay. Q copies of both reports as Exhibits 2 and 3. A. Sure. Q. This would probably be a good time for me to hand these over to you.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that deal with fungal identification. I'm not I'm not cognizant of the specific one associated with the Level 1 analysis. Q. All right. Is your laboratory accredited by anyone? A. For for no, it is not. Q. Okay. And is there any specific accreditation for laboratories analyzing fire residue? A. I there may be. I'm I don't know. Q. Is there any specific accreditation, to your knowledge, for laboratories analyzing fungal spores? A. Yes, there is. The fungal spore accreditation is handled with the American Industrial Hygiene
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	only thing that would be construed as interpretation probably would be that I bolded some areas. Let me take a look at the re may I refer to the report, sir? Q. Yeah. Why don't we do this. A. Okay. Q. I already marked color A. Okay. Q copies of both reports as Exhibits 2 and 3. A. Sure. Q. This would probably be a good time for me to hand these over to you. A. Okay.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that deal with fungal identification. I'm not I'm not cognizant of the specific one associated with the Level 1 analysis. Q. All right. Is your laboratory accredited by anyone? A. For for no, it is not. Q. Okay. And is there any specific accreditation for laboratories analyzing fire residue? A. I there may be. I'm I don't know. Q. Is there any specific accreditation, to your knowledge, for laboratories analyzing fungal spores? A. Yes, there is. The fungal spore accreditation is handled with the American Industrial Hygiene Association. They have a couple different levels of
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	only thing that would be construed as interpretation probably would be that I bolded some areas. Let me take a look at the re may I refer to the report, sir? Q. Yeah. Why don't we do this. A. Okay. Q. I already marked color A. Okay. Q copies of both reports as Exhibits 2 and 3. A. Sure. Q. This would probably be a good time for me to hand these over to you. A. Okay. Q. First of all, is Exhibit 2 a true and correct copy of	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that deal with fungal identification. I'm not I'm not cognizant of the specific one associated with the Level 1 analysis. Q. All right. Is your laboratory accredited by anyone? A. For for no, it is not. Q. Okay. And is there any specific accreditation for laboratories analyzing fire residue? A. I there may be. I'm I don't know. Q. Is there any specific accreditation, to your knowledge, for laboratories analyzing fungal spores? A. Yes, there is. The fungal spore accreditation is handled with the American Industrial Hygiene Association. They have a couple different levels of accreditation. They have one process that they do
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	only thing that would be construed as interpretation probably would be that I bolded some areas. Let me take a look at the re may I refer to the report, sir? Q. Yeah. Why don't we do this. A. Okay. Q. I already marked color A. Okay. Q copies of both reports as Exhibits 2 and 3. A. Sure. Q. This would probably be a good time for me to hand these over to you. A. Okay. Q. First of all, is Exhibit 2 a true and correct copy of your report with respect to samples from the Days Inn on	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that deal with fungal identification. I'm not I'm not cognizant of the specific one associated with the Level 1 analysis. Q. All right. Is your laboratory accredited by anyone? A. For for no, it is not. Q. Okay. And is there any specific accreditation for laboratories analyzing fire residue? A. I there may be. I'm I don't know. Q. Is there any specific accreditation, to your knowledge, for laboratories analyzing fungal spores? A. Yes, there is. The fungal spore accreditation is handled with the American Industrial Hygiene Association. They have a couple different levels of accreditation. They have one process that they do through EMPAT that has for culturable fungi. There's
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	only thing that would be construed as interpretation probably would be that I bolded some areas. Let me take a look at the re may I refer to the report, sir? Q. Yeah. Why don't we do this. A. Okay. Q. I already marked color A. Okay. Q copies of both reports as Exhibits 2 and 3. A. Sure. Q. This would probably be a good time for me to hand these over to you. A. Okay. Q. First of all, is Exhibit 2 a true and correct copy of your report with respect to samples from the Days Inn on Hemlock Street?	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that deal with fungal identification. I'm not I'm not cognizant of the specific one associated with the Level 1 analysis. Q. All right. Is your laboratory accredited by anyone? A. For for no, it is not. Q. Okay. And is there any specific accreditation for laboratories analyzing fire residue? A. I there may be. I'm I don't know. Q. Is there any specific accreditation, to your knowledge, for laboratories analyzing fungal spores? A. Yes, there is. The fungal spore accreditation is handled with the American Industrial Hygiene Association. They have a couple different levels of accreditation. They have one process that they do through EMPAT that has for culturable fungi. There's also one that they do for nonviable fungal organisms. I
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	only thing that would be construed as interpretation probably would be that I bolded some areas. Let me take a look at the re may I refer to the report, sir? Q. Yeah. Why don't we do this. A. Okay. Q. I already marked color A. Okay. Q copies of both reports as Exhibits 2 and 3. A. Sure. Q. This would probably be a good time for me to hand these over to you. A. Okay. Q. First of all, is Exhibit 2 a true and correct copy of your report with respect to samples from the Days Inn on Hemlock Street? A. I'll just if you don't mind, I'll just compare to	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that deal with fungal identification. I'm not I'm not cognizant of the specific one associated with the Level 1 analysis. Q. All right. Is your laboratory accredited by anyone? A. For for no, it is not. Q. Okay. And is there any specific accreditation for laboratories analyzing fire residue? A. I there may be. I'm I don't know. Q. Is there any specific accreditation, to your knowledge, for laboratories analyzing fungal spores? A. Yes, there is. The fungal spore accreditation is handled with the American Industrial Hygiene Association. They have a couple different levels of accreditation. They have one process that they do through EMPAT that has for culturable fungal. There's also one that they do for nonviable fungal organisms. I do participate in the in both of those through the

	Page 22	1	Page 24
1	include your lab that you have at home and what you use	1	Q. Okay. You've never been licensed in the medical field?
2	at Minnesota?	2	A. No, I have not been licensed.
3	A. I'm not exactly sure we're are you saying being not	3	Q. Do you have any training in toxicology?
4	accredited, or what are you saying?	4	A. Yes. I've had training in toxicology through the
5	Q. Yeah. If I understood your testimony earlier, you said	5	University of Minnesota with respect to the master's
6	you sometimes use a microscope at the University of	6	program I had. I took a course in toxicology. I also
7	Minnesota, and you sometimes use one that's at your home	7	took some courses in there was a seminar that was in
8	laboratory, correct?	8	New York on microtoxins. So I've done some work on
9	A. Yes. Yes.	9	that. And there through the continuation education
10	Q. Do you know where you performed the analysis in this	10	that I received here, there's probably been many other
11	case?	11	courses on it, but I don't recall all of them.
12	A. I I do not recall. It would have been in one or the	12	Q. Okay. You're not a toxicologist though?
13	other. I would say, given what I'm looking at here, let	13	A. That is correct.
14	me look at the	14	Q. Okay.
15	Q. Sure.	15	A. I am not a toxicologist.
16	A. May I look at the photos? And that would tell me. The	16	Q. Are your opinions in this case, are they fully expressed
17	photos are taken with my microscope at home. If I took	17	here in what you see as Exhibits 2 and 3?
18	the photos with the microscope at the university, there	18	A. As far as I know, unless you ask me a question that
19	would be a grid marking.	19	might trigger something else.
20	Q. Okay. Your home lab is not accredited by or	20	Q. Sure.
21	accredited by any organization, correct?	21	A. But as far as I know, yes.
22	A. That is correct. Yes, sir.	22	Q. Okay. Let's talk about, first of all, your report for
23	Q. Do you have any background in the field of construction	23	the Days Inn.
24	or engineering?	24	A. Okay.
25	A. Modest background. Not in not with respect to	25	Q. I believe we marked that as Exhibit 2, right?
	Page 23		Page 25
١.	Page 23		Page 25
1	construction, but with respect to investigating		A. That is correct. Yes, sir.
2	construction, but with respect to investigating buildings that have had water damage and that type of	2	A. That is correct. Yes, sir. Q. Actually before we get into that, you so when you're
2	construction, but with respect to investigating buildings that have had water damage and that type of stuff, and some experience with plan review for building	2	A. That is correct. Yes, sir. Q. Actually before we get into that, you so when you're retained by FBS, they send you well, how do they send
2 3 4	construction, but with respect to investigating buildings that have had water damage and that type of stuff, and some experience with plan review for building construction, and then in certification of buildings	2 3 4	A. That is correct. Yes, sir. Q. Actually before we get into that, you so when you're retained by FBS, they send you well, how do they send you samples to analyze?
2 3 4 5	construction, but with respect to investigating buildings that have had water damage and that type of stuff, and some experience with plan review for building construction, and then in certification of buildings post construction.	2 3 4 5	A. That is correct. Yes, sir. Q. Actually before we get into that, you so when you're retained by FBS, they send you well, how do they send you samples to analyze? A. There's a couple different ways that they send.
2 3 4 5 6	construction, but with respect to investigating buildings that have had water damage and that type of stuff, and some experience with plan review for building construction, and then in certification of buildings post construction. Q. And what is your role in in those instances?	2 3 4 5	A. That is correct. Yes, sir. Q. Actually before we get into that, you so when you're retained by FBS, they send you well, how do they send you samples to analyze? A. There's a couple different ways that they send. Sometimes they will personally drop it off at my at
2 3 4 5 6 7	construction, but with respect to investigating buildings that have had water damage and that type of stuff, and some experience with plan review for building construction, and then in certification of buildings post construction. Q. And what is your role in in those instances? A. In those instances and those are primarily done	2 3 4 5 6 7	A. That is correct. Yes, sir. Q. Actually before we get into that, you so when you're retained by FBS, they send you well, how do they send you samples to analyze? A. There's a couple different ways that they send. Sometimes they will personally drop it off at my at the university location and hand it to me. In other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	construction, but with respect to investigating buildings that have had water damage and that type of stuff, and some experience with plan review for building construction, and then in certification of buildings post construction. Q. And what is your role in in those instances? A. In those instances and those are primarily done through the University of Minnesota. I will get a plan	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. That is correct. Yes, sir. Q. Actually before we get into that, you so when you're retained by FBS, they send you well, how do they send you samples to analyze? A. There's a couple different ways that they send. Sometimes they will personally drop it off at my at the university location and hand it to me. In other ways, they will ship it by mail to my residence. They
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	construction, but with respect to investigating buildings that have had water damage and that type of stuff, and some experience with plan review for building construction, and then in certification of buildings post construction. Q. And what is your role in in those instances? A. In those instances and those are primarily done through the University of Minnesota. I will get a plan review and then determine if the ventilation system is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. That is correct. Yes, sir. Q. Actually before we get into that, you so when you're retained by FBS, they send you well, how do they send you samples to analyze? A. There's a couple different ways that they send. Sometimes they will personally drop it off at my at the university location and hand it to me. In other ways, they will ship it by mail to my residence. They may also have it sent by UPS or FedEx and have it placed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	construction, but with respect to investigating buildings that have had water damage and that type of stuff, and some experience with plan review for building construction, and then in certification of buildings post construction. Q. And what is your role in in those instances? A. In those instances and those are primarily done through the University of Minnesota. I will get a plan review and then determine if the ventilation system is set up appropriately for the type of occupancy in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. That is correct. Yes, sir. Q. Actually before we get into that, you so when you're retained by FBS, they send you well, how do they send you samples to analyze? A. There's a couple different ways that they send. Sometimes they will personally drop it off at my at the university location and hand it to me. In other ways, they will ship it by mail to my residence. They may also have it sent by UPS or FedEx and have it placed in a box by my door.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	construction, but with respect to investigating buildings that have had water damage and that type of stuff, and some experience with plan review for building construction, and then in certification of buildings post construction. Q. And what is your role in in those instances? A. In those instances and those are primarily done through the University of Minnesota. I will get a plan review and then determine if the ventilation system is set up appropriately for the type of occupancy in the building, and then will do some review about proper	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. That is correct. Yes, sir. Q. Actually before we get into that, you so when you're retained by FBS, they send you well, how do they send you samples to analyze? A. There's a couple different ways that they send. Sometimes they will personally drop it off at my at the university location and hand it to me. In other ways, they will ship it by mail to my residence. They may also have it sent by UPS or FedEx and have it placed in a box by my door. Q. Do you know how the samples in this case were delivered
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	construction, but with respect to investigating buildings that have had water damage and that type of stuff, and some experience with plan review for building construction, and then in certification of buildings post construction. Q. And what is your role in in those instances? A. In those instances and those are primarily done through the University of Minnesota. I will get a plan review and then determine if the ventilation system is set up appropriately for the type of occupancy in the building, and then will do some review about proper drainage systems on the on the building. Not and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. That is correct. Yes, sir. Q. Actually before we get into that, you so when you're retained by FBS, they send you well, how do they send you samples to analyze? A. There's a couple different ways that they send. Sometimes they will personally drop it off at my at the university location and hand it to me. In other ways, they will ship it by mail to my residence. They may also have it sent by UPS or FedEx and have it placed in a box by my door. Q. Do you know how the samples in this case were delivered to you?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	construction, but with respect to investigating buildings that have had water damage and that type of stuff, and some experience with plan review for building construction, and then in certification of buildings post construction. Q. And what is your role in in those instances? A. In those instances and those are primarily done through the University of Minnesota. I will get a plan review and then determine if the ventilation system is set up appropriately for the type of occupancy in the building, and then will do some review about proper	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. That is correct. Yes, sir. Q. Actually before we get into that, you so when you're retained by FBS, they send you well, how do they send you samples to analyze? A. There's a couple different ways that they send. Sometimes they will personally drop it off at my at the university location and hand it to me. In other ways, they will ship it by mail to my residence. They may also have it sent by UPS or FedEx and have it placed in a box by my door. Q. Do you know how the samples in this case were delivered to you? A. I don't recall, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	construction, but with respect to investigating buildings that have had water damage and that type of stuff, and some experience with plan review for building construction, and then in certification of buildings post construction. Q. And what is your role in in those instances? A. In those instances and those are primarily done through the University of Minnesota. I will get a plan review and then determine if the ventilation system is set up appropriately for the type of occupancy in the building, and then will do some review about proper drainage systems on the on the building. Not and then, when they're doing remodeling for a roofing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. That is correct. Yes, sir. Q. Actually before we get into that, you so when you're retained by FBS, they send you well, how do they send you samples to analyze? A. There's a couple different ways that they send. Sometimes they will personally drop it off at my at the university location and hand it to me. In other ways, they will ship it by mail to my residence. They may also have it sent by UPS or FedEx and have it placed in a box by my door. Q. Do you know how the samples in this case were delivered to you?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	construction, but with respect to investigating buildings that have had water damage and that type of stuff, and some experience with plan review for building construction, and then in certification of buildings post construction. Q. And what is your role in in those instances? A. In those instances and those are primarily done through the University of Minnesota. I will get a plan review and then determine if the ventilation system is set up appropriately for the type of occupancy in the building, and then will do some review about proper drainage systems on the on the building. Not and then, when they're doing remodeling for a roofing project, will take a look at the location of the of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. That is correct. Yes, sir. Q. Actually before we get into that, you so when you're retained by FBS, they send you well, how do they send you samples to analyze? A. There's a couple different ways that they send. Sometimes they will personally drop it off at my at the university location and hand it to me. In other ways, they will ship it by mail to my residence. They may also have it sent by UPS or FedEx and have it placed in a box by my door. Q. Do you know how the samples in this case were delivered to you? A. I don't recall, sir. Q. Okay. Suffice to say though, at some point you received
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	construction, but with respect to investigating buildings that have had water damage and that type of stuff, and some experience with plan review for building construction, and then in certification of buildings post construction. Q. And what is your role in in those instances? A. In those instances and those are primarily done through the University of Minnesota. I will get a plan review and then determine if the ventilation system is set up appropriately for the type of occupancy in the building, and then will do some review about proper drainage systems on the on the building. Not and then, when they're doing remodeling for a roofing project, will take a look at the location of the of the asphalt device and with respect to air intakes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. That is correct. Yes, sir. Q. Actually before we get into that, you so when you're retained by FBS, they send you well, how do they send you samples to analyze? A. There's a couple different ways that they send. Sometimes they will personally drop it off at my at the university location and hand it to me. In other ways, they will ship it by mail to my residence. They may also have it sent by UPS or FedEx and have it placed in a box by my door. Q. Do you know how the samples in this case were delivered to you? A. I don't recall, sir. Q. Okay. Suffice to say though, at some point you received some samples from FBS with respect to the Days Inn and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	construction, but with respect to investigating buildings that have had water damage and that type of stuff, and some experience with plan review for building construction, and then in certification of buildings post construction. Q. And what is your role in in those instances? A. In those instances and those are primarily done through the University of Minnesota. I will get a plan review and then determine if the ventilation system is set up appropriately for the type of occupancy in the building, and then will do some review about proper drainage systems on the on the building. Not and then, when they're doing remodeling for a roofing project, will take a look at the location of the of the asphalt device and with respect to air intakes. For the consulting, I have done some inspections,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. That is correct. Yes, sir. Q. Actually before we get into that, you so when you're retained by FBS, they send you well, how do they send you samples to analyze? A. There's a couple different ways that they send. Sometimes they will personally drop it off at my at the university location and hand it to me. In other ways, they will ship it by mail to my residence. They may also have it sent by UPS or FedEx and have it placed in a box by my door. Q. Do you know how the samples in this case were delivered to you? A. I don't recall, sir. Q. Okay. Suffice to say though, at some point you received some samples from FBS with respect to the Days Inn and the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	construction, but with respect to investigating buildings that have had water damage and that type of stuff, and some experience with plan review for building construction, and then in certification of buildings post construction. Q. And what is your role in in those instances? A. In those instances and those are primarily done through the University of Minnesota. I will get a plan review and then determine if the ventilation system is set up appropriately for the type of occupancy in the building, and then will do some review about proper drainage systems on the on the building. Not and then, when they're doing remodeling for a roofing project, will take a look at the location of the of the asphalt device and with respect to air intakes. For the consulting, I have done some inspections, and more recently, and that would be after these reports	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. That is correct. Yes, sir. Q. Actually before we get into that, you so when you're retained by FBS, they send you well, how do they send you samples to analyze? A. There's a couple different ways that they send. Sometimes they will personally drop it off at my at the university location and hand it to me. In other ways, they will ship it by mail to my residence. They may also have it sent by UPS or FedEx and have it placed in a box by my door. Q. Do you know how the samples in this case were delivered to you? A. I don't recall, sir. Q. Okay. Suffice to say though, at some point you received some samples from FBS with respect to the Days Inn and the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, correct? A. Yes. That's correct, yeah.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	construction, but with respect to investigating buildings that have had water damage and that type of stuff, and some experience with plan review for building construction, and then in certification of buildings post construction. Q. And what is your role in in those instances? A. In those instances and those are primarily done through the University of Minnesota. I will get a plan review and then determine if the ventilation system is set up appropriately for the type of occupancy in the building, and then will do some review about proper drainage systems on the on the building. Not and then, when they're doing remodeling for a roofing project, will take a look at the location of the of the asphalt device and with respect to air intakes. For the consulting, I have done some inspections, and more recently, and that would be after these reports were done, but in a building where there's been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. That is correct. Yes, sir. Q. Actually before we get into that, you so when you're retained by FBS, they send you well, how do they send you samples to analyze? A. There's a couple different ways that they send. Sometimes they will personally drop it off at my at the university location and hand it to me. In other ways, they will ship it by mail to my residence. They may also have it sent by UPS or FedEx and have it placed in a box by my door. Q. Do you know how the samples in this case were delivered to you? A. I don't recall, sir. Q. Okay. Suffice to say though, at some point you received some samples from FBS with respect to the Days Inn and the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, correct? A. Yes. That's correct, yeah. Q. And I assume you're the only basis you had for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	construction, but with respect to investigating buildings that have had water damage and that type of stuff, and some experience with plan review for building construction, and then in certification of buildings post construction. Q. And what is your role in in those instances? A. In those instances and those are primarily done through the University of Minnesota. I will get a plan review and then determine if the ventilation system is set up appropriately for the type of occupancy in the building, and then will do some review about proper drainage systems on the on the building. Not and then, when they're doing remodeling for a roofing project, will take a look at the location of the of the asphalt device and with respect to air intakes. For the consulting, I have done some inspections, and more recently, and that would be after these reports were done, but in a building where there's been significant fire damage. And they ask me to come in and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. That is correct. Yes, sir. Q. Actually before we get into that, you so when you're retained by FBS, they send you well, how do they send you samples to analyze? A. There's a couple different ways that they send. Sometimes they will personally drop it off at my at the university location and hand it to me. In other ways, they will ship it by mail to my residence. They may also have it sent by UPS or FedEx and have it placed in a box by my door. Q. Do you know how the samples in this case were delivered to you? A. I don't recall, sir. Q. Okay. Suffice to say though, at some point you received some samples from FBS with respect to the Days Inn and the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, correct? A. Yes. That's correct, yeah. Q. And I assume you're the only basis you had for knowing that they came from Days Inn and Rocky Waters
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	construction, but with respect to investigating buildings that have had water damage and that type of stuff, and some experience with plan review for building construction, and then in certification of buildings post construction. Q. And what is your role in in those instances? A. In those instances and those are primarily done through the University of Minnesota. I will get a plan review and then determine if the ventilation system is set up appropriately for the type of occupancy in the building, and then will do some review about proper drainage systems on the on the building. Not and then, when they're doing remodeling for a roofing project, will take a look at the location of the of the asphalt device and with respect to air intakes. For the consulting, I have done some inspections, and more recently, and that would be after these reports were done, but in a building where there's been significant fire damage. And they ask me to come in and assist with developing a sampling protocol and then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. That is correct. Yes, sir. Q. Actually before we get into that, you so when you're retained by FBS, they send you well, how do they send you samples to analyze? A. There's a couple different ways that they send. Sometimes they will personally drop it off at my at the university location and hand it to me. In other ways, they will ship it by mail to my residence. They may also have it sent by UPS or FedEx and have it placed in a box by my door. Q. Do you know how the samples in this case were delivered to you? A. I don't recall, sir. Q. Okay. Suffice to say though, at some point you received some samples from FBS with respect to the Days Inn and the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, correct? A. Yes. That's correct, yeah. Q. And I assume you're the only basis you had for knowing that they came from Days Inn and Rocky Waters Motor Inn was information you got from FBS, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	construction, but with respect to investigating buildings that have had water damage and that type of stuff, and some experience with plan review for building construction, and then in certification of buildings post construction. Q. And what is your role in in those instances? A. In those instances and those are primarily done through the University of Minnesota. I will get a plan review and then determine if the ventilation system is set up appropriately for the type of occupancy in the building, and then will do some review about proper drainage systems on the on the building. Not and then, when they're doing remodeling for a roofing project, will take a look at the location of the of the asphalt device and with respect to air intakes. For the consulting, I have done some inspections, and more recently, and that would be after these reports were done, but in a building where there's been significant fire damage. And they ask me to come in and assist with developing a sampling protocol and then analyzing the the samples.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. That is correct. Yes, sir. Q. Actually before we get into that, you so when you're retained by FBS, they send you well, how do they send you samples to analyze? A. There's a couple different ways that they send. Sometimes they will personally drop it off at my at the university location and hand it to me. In other ways, they will ship it by mail to my residence. They may also have it sent by UPS or FedEx and have it placed in a box by my door. Q. Do you know how the samples in this case were delivered to you? A. I don't recall, sir. Q. Okay. Suffice to say though, at some point you received some samples from FBS with respect to the Days Inn and the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, correct? A. Yes. That's correct, yeah. Q. And I assume you're the only basis you had for knowing that they came from Days Inn and Rocky Waters Motor Inn was information you got from FBS, correct? A. That is correct, sir, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	construction, but with respect to investigating buildings that have had water damage and that type of stuff, and some experience with plan review for building construction, and then in certification of buildings post construction. Q. And what is your role in in those instances? A. In those instances and those are primarily done through the University of Minnesota. I will get a plan review and then determine if the ventilation system is set up appropriately for the type of occupancy in the building, and then will do some review about proper drainage systems on the on the building. Not and then, when they're doing remodeling for a roofing project, will take a look at the location of the of the asphalt device and with respect to air intakes. For the consulting, I have done some inspections, and more recently, and that would be after these reports were done, but in a building where there's been significant fire damage. And they ask me to come in and assist with developing a sampling protocol and then analyzing the the samples. Q. Do you have any medical training?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. That is correct. Yes, sir. Q. Actually before we get into that, you so when you're retained by FBS, they send you well, how do they send you samples to analyze? A. There's a couple different ways that they send. Sometimes they will personally drop it off at my at the university location and hand it to me. In other ways, they will ship it by mail to my residence. They may also have it sent by UPS or FedEx and have it placed in a box by my door. Q. Do you know how the samples in this case were delivered to you? A. I don't recall, sir. Q. Okay. Suffice to say though, at some point you received some samples from FBS with respect to the Days Inn and the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, correct? A. Yes. That's correct, yeah. Q. And I assume you're the only basis you had for knowing that they came from Days Inn and Rocky Waters Motor Inn was information you got from FBS, correct? A. That is correct, sir, yes. Q. Have you have you ever been to either of those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	construction, but with respect to investigating buildings that have had water damage and that type of stuff, and some experience with plan review for building construction, and then in certification of buildings post construction. Q. And what is your role in in those instances? A. In those instances and those are primarily done through the University of Minnesota. I will get a plan review and then determine if the ventilation system is set up appropriately for the type of occupancy in the building, and then will do some review about proper drainage systems on the on the building. Not and then, when they're doing remodeling for a roofing project, will take a look at the location of the of the asphalt device and with respect to air intakes. For the consulting, I have done some inspections, and more recently, and that would be after these reports were done, but in a building where there's been significant fire damage. And they ask me to come in and assist with developing a sampling protocol and then analyzing the the samples. Q. Do you have any medical training? A. I received training as a certified nursing assistant and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. That is correct. Yes, sir. Q. Actually before we get into that, you so when you're retained by FBS, they send you well, how do they send you samples to analyze? A. There's a couple different ways that they send. Sometimes they will personally drop it off at my at the university location and hand it to me. In other ways, they will ship it by mail to my residence. They may also have it sent by UPS or FedEx and have it placed in a box by my door. Q. Do you know how the samples in this case were delivered to you? A. I don't recall, sir. Q. Okay. Suffice to say though, at some point you received some samples from FBS with respect to the Days Inn and the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, correct? A. Yes. That's correct, yeah. Q. And I assume you're the only basis you had for knowing that they came from Days Inn and Rocky Waters Motor Inn was information you got from FBS, correct? A. That is correct, sir, yes. Q. Have you have you ever been to either of those properties?

ı	Page 26	Page 28
1	you reviewed any any estimates related to the	1 have a location where I can do my write-up on the
2	insurance claim?	2 report, and then a disposal spot for the materials when
3	A. I want to think for a second to make sure. I don't	3 I'm finished.
4	recall seeing any estimates on this one, and, if	4 Q. Okay. I asked a little bit earlier about accreditation
5	something comes to light later, that would be just	5 for laboratories.
6	because of faulty memory, but I don't recall.	6 A. Yes.
7	Q. Have you reviewed any other expert reports in this case?	7 Q. Is there any licensing or accreditation that is given
8	A. I did review one, two sets of other expert reports with	8 out to individuals like yourself?
9	respect to both the Rocky Waters Motor Inn and the Days	9 A. I am not aware of that. Or I'm now let's clarify
10	Inn.	10 your question. Is that with respect to analysis of char
11	Q. And what reports were those?	11 and soot? Is that what you're asking, or
12	A. That was a Level 4 analysis, and I don't recall the name	12 Q. Well, let's start there. With respect to analysis of
13	of the company. That was done on both properties.	13 char and soot, is there any accreditation that's given
14	O. Okay. Was it Enrique Medina Alliance Consulting?	14 out to individuals?
15	A. I I think that's probably it. I don't recall	15 A. I do not know if there is. If there is, I'm not aware
		16 of it.
16 17	the name, but I think so. Q. Okay.	17 Q. How about with respect to analysis of fungal samples?
18	Q. Okay. A. Is it a company based out of California?	18 A. Well, the accreditation that I talked to, referred to
	. ,	19 previously with respect to the American Industrial
19	Q. Yes, sir. A. Okay. Then I believe that would be it.	20 Hygiene Association, and EMPAT does have accreditation.
20	Q. Okay. Beyond beyond the fact that they did a Level 4	21 Q. Okay. And earlier I asked if your laboratory was
21 22	analysis, as you sit here today, do you have any	22 accredited. Let me ask the same question. Are you
	specific recollection of Mr. Medina's or Alliance	
23	·	23 personally accredited by any organizations or licensed
24	Consulting's findings? A. Other than the fact that it was a Level 4 and that they	24 by any organizations?
25	A, Other than the fact that it was a Level 4 and that they	25 A. I'm not accredited for any specific analysis. I do have
	Page 27	D= == 20
1	rage 27	Page 29
1	found, or they found at least reading through it,	Page 29
1 2		
	found, or they found at least reading through it,	1 a certified industrial hygienist, but that's not an
2	found, or they found at least reading through it, based on their report, they found char and soot	1 a certified industrial hygienist, but that's not an 2 accreditation. Is that clear
2	found, or they found at least reading through it, based on their report, they found char and soot particles and that there was a suggestion about using	1 a certified industrial hygienist, but that's not an 2 accreditation. Is that clear 3 Q. Yeah.
2 3 4	found, or they found at least reading through it, based on their report, they found char and soot particles and that there was a suggestion about using that analysis to determine possible origin of the fire.	1 a certified industrial hygienist, but that's not an 2 accreditation. Is that clear 3 Q. Yeah. 4 A for you?
2 3 4 5	found, or they found at least reading through it, based on their report, they found char and soot particles and that there was a suggestion about using that analysis to determine possible origin of the fire. Q. Okay. Beyond that, do you have any recollection or	a certified industrial hygienist, but that's not an accreditation. Is that clear Q. Yeah. A for you? Q. That's clear. Okay. So once you explain to me the
2 3 4 5	found, or they found at least reading through it, based on their report, they found char and soot particles and that there was a suggestion about using that analysis to determine possible origin of the fire. Q. Okay. Beyond that, do you have any recollection or opinions about the report?	a certified industrial hygienist, but that's not an accreditation. Is that clear Q. Yeah. A for you? Q. That's clear. Okay. So once you explain to me the process of getting the samples out of their container
2 3 4 5 6 7	found, or they found at least reading through it, based on their report, they found char and soot particles and that there was a suggestion about using that analysis to determine possible origin of the fire. Q. Okay. Beyond that, do you have any recollection or opinions about the report? A. Not that I can recall right now. But if there's another	a certified industrial hygienist, but that's not an accreditation. Is that clear Q. Yeah. A for you? Q. That's clear. Okay. So once you explain to me the process of getting the samples out of their container and onto a onto a slide, a microscope.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	found, or they found at least reading through it, based on their report, they found char and soot particles and that there was a suggestion about using that analysis to determine possible origin of the fire. Q. Okay. Beyond that, do you have any recollection or opinions about the report? A. Not that I can recall right now. But if there's another question that comes up that triggers it, I will respond.	a certified industrial hygienist, but that's not an accreditation. Is that clear Q. Yeah. A for you? Q. That's clear. Okay. So once you explain to me the process of getting the samples out of their container and onto a onto a slide, a microscope. A. Sure. The samples would typically be in a in a box or a plastic Ziploc bag. I don't recall specifically with respect to these samples. I'd take the sample out,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	found, or they found at least reading through it, based on their report, they found char and soot particles and that there was a suggestion about using that analysis to determine possible origin of the fire. Q. Okay. Beyond that, do you have any recollection or opinions about the report? A. Not that I can recall right now. But if there's another question that comes up that triggers it, I will respond. Q. Certainly. Okay. All right. So, once you receive a	a certified industrial hygienist, but that's not an accreditation. Is that clear Q. Yeah. A for you? Q. That's clear. Okay. So once you explain to me the process of getting the samples out of their container and onto a onto a slide, a microscope. A. Sure. The samples would typically be in a in a box or a plastic Ziploc bag. I don't recall specifically
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	found, or they found at least reading through it, based on their report, they found char and soot particles and that there was a suggestion about using that analysis to determine possible origin of the fire. Q. Okay. Beyond that, do you have any recollection or opinions about the report? A. Not that I can recall right now. But if there's another question that comes up that triggers it, I will respond. Q. Certainly. Okay. All right. So, once you receive a sample from FBS, what do you do with it?	a certified industrial hygienist, but that's not an accreditation. Is that clear Q. Yeah. A for you? Q. That's clear. Okay. So once you explain to me the process of getting the samples out of their container and onto a onto a slide, a microscope. A. Sure. The samples would typically be in a in a box or a plastic Ziploc bag. I don't recall specifically with respect to these samples. I'd take the sample out,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	found, or they found at least reading through it, based on their report, they found char and soot particles and that there was a suggestion about using that analysis to determine possible origin of the fire. Q. Okay. Beyond that, do you have any recollection or opinions about the report? A. Not that I can recall right now. But if there's another question that comes up that triggers it, I will respond. Q. Certainly. Okay. All right. So, once you receive a sample from FBS, what do you do with it? A. Well, the first thing I do is take it into my lab area,	a certified industrial hygienist, but that's not an accreditation. Is that clear Q. Yeah. A for you? Q. That's clear. Okay. So once you explain to me the process of getting the samples out of their container and onto a onto a slide, a microscope. A. Sure. The samples would typically be in a in a box or a plastic Ziploc bag. I don't recall specifically with respect to these samples. I'd take the sample out, and it depends on if it's okay, I'm going to look and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	found, or they found at least reading through it, based on their report, they found char and soot particles and that there was a suggestion about using that analysis to determine possible origin of the fire. Q. Okay. Beyond that, do you have any recollection or opinions about the report? A. Not that I can recall right now. But if there's another question that comes up that triggers it, I will respond. Q. Certainly. Okay. All right. So, once you receive a sample from FBS, what do you do with it? A. Well, the first thing I do is take it into my lab area, and then I will sign off on the the chain of custody.	a certified industrial hygienist, but that's not an accreditation. Is that clear Q. Yeah. A for you? Q. That's clear. Okay. So once you explain to me the process of getting the samples out of their container and onto a onto a slide, a microscope. A. Sure. The samples would typically be in a in a box or a plastic Ziploc bag. I don't recall specifically with respect to these samples. I'd take the sample out, and it depends on if it's okay, I'm going to look and see if, you know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	found, or they found at least reading through it, based on their report, they found char and soot particles and that there was a suggestion about using that analysis to determine possible origin of the fire. Q. Okay. Beyond that, do you have any recollection or opinions about the report? A. Not that I can recall right now. But if there's another question that comes up that triggers it, I will respond. Q. Certainly. Okay. All right. So, once you receive a sample from FBS, what do you do with it? A. Well, the first thing I do is take it into my lab area, and then I will sign off on the the chain of custody. So I'll I think I probably got a copy of it for each	a certified industrial hygienist, but that's not an accreditation. Is that clear Q. Yeah. A for you? Q. That's clear. Okay. So once you explain to me the process of getting the samples out of their container and onto a onto a slide, a microscope. A. Sure. The samples would typically be in a in a box or a plastic Ziploc bag. I don't recall specifically with respect to these samples. I'd take the sample out, and it depends on if it's okay, I'm going to look and see if, you know 13 Q. Sure.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	found, or they found at least reading through it, based on their report, they found char and soot particles and that there was a suggestion about using that analysis to determine possible origin of the fire. Q. Okay. Beyond that, do you have any recollection or opinions about the report? A. Not that I can recall right now. But if there's another question that comes up that triggers it, I will respond. Q. Certainly. Okay. All right. So, once you receive a sample from FBS, what do you do with it? A. Well, the first thing I do is take it into my lab area, and then I will sign off on the the chain of custody. So I'll I think I probably got a copy of it for each one. But I'll sign and date when I receive the sample,	a certified industrial hygienist, but that's not an accreditation. Is that clear Q. Yeah. A for you? Q. That's clear. Okay. So once you explain to me the process of getting the samples out of their container and onto a onto a slide, a microscope. A. Sure. The samples would typically be in a in a box or a plastic Ziploc bag. I don't recall specifically with respect to these samples. I'd take the sample out, and it depends on if it's okay, I'm going to look and see if, you know Q. Sure. A what type we've got. So these, in the right now we're referring to Days Inn, correct? Q. Well, my question is more general.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	found, or they found at least reading through it, based on their report, they found char and soot particles and that there was a suggestion about using that analysis to determine possible origin of the fire. Q. Okay. Beyond that, do you have any recollection or opinions about the report? A. Not that I can recall right now. But if there's another question that comes up that triggers it, I will respond. Q. Certainly. Okay. All right. So, once you receive a sample from FBS, what do you do with it? A. Well, the first thing I do is take it into my lab area, and then I will sign off on the the chain of custody. So I'll I think I probably got a copy of it for each one. But I'll sign and date when I receive the sample, and then then I'll sign and then I will date it when	a certified industrial hygienist, but that's not an accreditation. Is that clear Q. Yeah. A for you? Q. That's clear. Okay. So once you explain to me the process of getting the samples out of their container and onto a onto a slide, a microscope. A. Sure. The samples would typically be in a in a box or a plastic Ziploc bag. I don't recall specifically with respect to these samples. I'd take the sample out, and it depends on if it's okay, I'm going to look and see if, you know Q. Sure. A what type we've got. So these, in the right now we're referring to Days Inn, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	found, or they found at least reading through it, based on their report, they found char and soot particles and that there was a suggestion about using that analysis to determine possible origin of the fire. Q. Okay. Beyond that, do you have any recollection or opinions about the report? A. Not that I can recall right now. But if there's another question that comes up that triggers it, I will respond. Q. Certainly. Okay. All right. So, once you receive a sample from FBS, what do you do with it? A. Well, the first thing I do is take it into my lab area, and then I will sign off on the the chain of custody. So I'll I think I probably got a copy of it for each one. But I'll sign and date when I receive the sample, and then then I'll sign and then I will date it when I did the analysis.	a certified industrial hygienist, but that's not an accreditation. Is that clear Q. Yeah. A for you? Q. That's clear. Okay. So once you explain to me the process of getting the samples out of their container and onto a onto a slide, a microscope. A. Sure. The samples would typically be in a in a box or a plastic Ziploc bag. I don't recall specifically with respect to these samples. I'd take the sample out, and it depends on if it's okay, I'm going to look and see if, you know Q. Sure. A what type we've got. So these, in the right now we're referring to Days Inn, correct? Q. Well, my question is more general.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	found, or they found at least reading through it, based on their report, they found char and soot particles and that there was a suggestion about using that analysis to determine possible origin of the fire. Q. Okay. Beyond that, do you have any recollection or opinions about the report? A. Not that I can recall right now. But if there's another question that comes up that triggers it, I will respond. Q. Certainly. Okay. All right. So, once you receive a sample from FBS, what do you do with it? A. Well, the first thing I do is take it into my lab area, and then I will sign off on the the chain of custody. So I'll I think I probably got a copy of it for each one. But I'll sign and date when I receive the sample, and then then I'll sign and then I will date it when I did the analysis. Q. Where where is your lab located in your home?	a certified industrial hygienist, but that's not an accreditation. Is that clear Q. Yeah. A for you? Q. That's clear. Okay. So once you explain to me the process of getting the samples out of their container and onto a onto a slide, a microscope. A. Sure. The samples would typically be in a in a box or a plastic Ziploc bag. I don't recall specifically with respect to these samples. I'd take the sample out, and it depends on if it's okay, I'm going to look and see if, you know Q. Sure. A what type we've got. So these, in the right now we're referring to Days Inn, correct? Q. Well, my question is more general. A. Okay. So for an Air-O-Cell cassette, I would write down
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	found, or they found at least reading through it, based on their report, they found char and soot particles and that there was a suggestion about using that analysis to determine possible origin of the fire. Q. Okay. Beyond that, do you have any recollection or opinions about the report? A. Not that I can recall right now. But if there's another question that comes up that triggers it, I will respond. Q. Certainly. Okay. All right. So, once you receive a sample from FBS, what do you do with it? A. Well, the first thing I do is take it into my lab area, and then I will sign off on the the chain of custody. So I'll I think I probably got a copy of it for each one. But I'll sign and date when I receive the sample, and then then I'll sign and then I will date it when I did the analysis. Q. Where where is your lab located in your home? A. It is in I got to get the directions right. It is in	a certified industrial hygienist, but that's not an accreditation. Is that clear Q. Yeah. A for you? Q. That's clear. Okay. So once you explain to me the process of getting the samples out of their container and onto a onto a slide, a microscope. A. Sure. The samples would typically be in a in a box or a plastic Ziploc bag. I don't recall specifically with respect to these samples. I'd take the sample out, and it depends on if it's okay, I'm going to look and see if, you know Q. Sure. A what type we've got. So these, in the right now we're referring to Days Inn, correct? Q. Well, my question is more general. A. Okay. So for an Air-O-Cell cassette, I would write down the information that's presented on the Air-O-Cell
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	found, or they found at least reading through it, based on their report, they found char and soot particles and that there was a suggestion about using that analysis to determine possible origin of the fire. Q. Okay. Beyond that, do you have any recollection or opinions about the report? A. Not that I can recall right now. But if there's another question that comes up that triggers it, I will respond. Q. Certainly. Okay. All right. So, once you receive a sample from FBS, what do you do with it? A. Well, the first thing I do is take it into my lab area, and then I will sign off on the the chain of custody. So I'll I think I probably got a copy of it for each one. But I'll sign and date when I receive the sample, and then then I'll sign and then I will date it when I did the analysis. Q. Where where is your lab located in your home? A. It is in I got to get the directions right. It is in the southwest corner of my house.	a certified industrial hygienist, but that's not an accreditation. Is that clear Q. Yeah. A for you? Q. That's clear. Okay. So once you explain to me the process of getting the samples out of their container and onto a onto a slide, a microscope. A. Sure. The samples would typically be in a in a box or a plastic Ziploc bag. I don't recall specifically with respect to these samples. I'd take the sample out, and it depends on if it's okay, I'm going to look and see if, you know Q. Sure. A what type we've got. So these, in the right now we're referring to Days Inn, correct? Q. Well, my question is more general. A. Okay. So for an Air-O-Cell cassette, I would write down the information that's presented on the Air-O-Cell cassette and place it on a lab report form. And, for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	found, or they found at least reading through it, based on their report, they found char and soot particles and that there was a suggestion about using that analysis to determine possible origin of the fire. Q. Okay. Beyond that, do you have any recollection or opinions about the report? A. Not that I can recall right now. But if there's another question that comes up that triggers it, I will respond. Q. Certainly. Okay. All right. So, once you receive a sample from FBS, what do you do with it? A. Well, the first thing I do is take it into my lab area, and then I will sign off on the the chain of custody. So I'll I think I probably got a copy of it for each one. But I'll sign and date when I receive the sample, and then then I'll sign and then I will date it when I did the analysis. Q. Where where is your lab located in your home? A. It is in I got to get the directions right. It is in the southwest corner of my house. Q. First floor or basement?	a certified industrial hygienist, but that's not an accreditation. Is that clear Q. Yeah. A for you? Q. That's clear. Okay. So once you explain to me the process of getting the samples out of their container and onto a onto a slide, a microscope. A. Sure. The samples would typically be in a in a box or a plastic Ziploc bag. I don't recall specifically with respect to these samples. I'd take the sample out, and it depends on if it's okay, I'm going to look and see if, you know Q. Sure. A what type we've got. So these, in the right now we're referring to Days Inn, correct? Q. Well, my question is more general. A. Okay. So for an Air-O-Cell cassette, I would write down the information that's presented on the Air-O-Cell cassette and place it on a lab report form. And, for instance, sample 1, and then all the information I can.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	found, or they found at least reading through it, based on their report, they found char and soot particles and that there was a suggestion about using that analysis to determine possible origin of the fire. Q. Okay. Beyond that, do you have any recollection or opinions about the report? A. Not that I can recall right now. But if there's another question that comes up that triggers it, I will respond. Q. Certainly. Okay. All right. So, once you receive a sample from FBS, what do you do with it? A. Well, the first thing I do is take it into my lab area, and then I will sign off on the the chain of custody. So I'll I think I probably got a copy of it for each one. But I'll sign and date when I receive the sample, and then then I'll sign and then I will date it when I did the analysis. Q. Where where is your lab located in your home? A. It is in I got to get the directions right. It is in the southwest corner of my house. Q. First floor or basement? A. It's it's a split level. So it would be first floor.	a certified industrial hygienist, but that's not an accreditation. Is that clear Q. Yeah. A for you? Q. That's clear. Okay. So once you explain to me the process of getting the samples out of their container and onto a onto a slide, a microscope. A. Sure. The samples would typically be in a in a box or a plastic Ziploc bag. I don't recall specifically with respect to these samples. I'd take the sample out, and it depends on if it's okay, I'm going to look and see if, you know Q. Sure. A what type we've got. So these, in the right now we're referring to Days Inn, correct? Q. Well, my question is more general. A. Okay. So for an Air-O-Cell cassette, I would write down the information that's presented on the Air-O-Cell cassette and place it on a lab report form. And, for instance, sample 1, and then all the information I can. Do a line below that and then take the there's an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	found, or they found at least reading through it, based on their report, they found char and soot particles and that there was a suggestion about using that analysis to determine possible origin of the fire. Q. Okay. Beyond that, do you have any recollection or opinions about the report? A. Not that I can recall right now. But if there's another question that comes up that triggers it, I will respond. Q. Certainly. Okay. All right. So, once you receive a sample from FBS, what do you do with it? A. Well, the first thing I do is take it into my lab area, and then I will sign off on the the chain of custody. So I'll I think I probably got a copy of it for each one. But I'll sign and date when I receive the sample, and then then I'll sign and then I will date it when I did the analysis. Q. Where where is your lab located in your home? A. It is in I got to get the directions right. It is in the southwest corner of my house. Q. First floor or basement? A. It's it's a split level. So it would be first floor. Q. Okay. Is it an isolated room?	a certified industrial hygienist, but that's not an accreditation. Is that clear Q. Yeah. A for you? Q. That's clear. Okay. So once you explain to me the process of getting the samples out of their container and onto a onto a slide, a microscope. A. Sure. The samples would typically be in a in a box or a plastic Ziploc bag. I don't recall specifically with respect to these samples. I'd take the sample out, and it depends on if it's okay, I'm going to look and see if, you know Q. Sure. A what type we've got. So these, in the right now we're referring to Days Inn, correct? Q. Well, my question is more general. A. Okay. So for an Air-O-Cell cassette, I would write down the information that's presented on the Air-O-Cell cassette and place it on a lab report form. And, for instance, sample 1, and then all the information I can. Do a line below that and then take the there's an inside open up the Air-O-Cell cassette, and inside

	Page 30		Page 32
	rage 30		
1	place mounting fluid on a clear coverslip, and then	1	very plainer. It will have defined edges. Sometimes
2	place that directly on top of the of that material,	2	the char particle will have open circles in several
3	and then take that directly onto a microscope stage and	3	spots due to the type of burn it's had. They may be a
4	then visually look through the field. And then for	4	black and opaque with sharp edges, or they may be sort
5	soot-like and char-like particles, then and also look	5	of amber colored, but, in general, they're fairly
6	for fungal particles. And in some case, with respect to	6	they're kind of I would call it sheets or very thin
7	the Air-O-Cell cassette, make some sort of determination	7	sheets with much larger width and length than than
8	with respect to the density of the trace and then mark	8	depth. Very thin.
9	that information down in the lab note here. Once I'm	9	The soot particles are typically less than one
10	done with that, then I will dispose of that in a Sharps	10	micron in size. They'll be a spherical. They tend to
11	container.	11	agglomerate into what look like small grapelike
12	Q. Okay. Where does your training or expertise in terms of	12	clusters. The edges are irregular. They're they are
13	how to visually differentiate between char and soot come	13	less opaque or less dark than the char particles and
14	from?	14	they'll have uneven edges. And they'll it's very
15	A. When we first began, Tom Irmiter approached me and he	15	difficult with the light microscopy microscopy to
16	asked me if I could do this analysis. And I said I am	16	pick out one, but it can be pick out clusters. So
17	not familiar with it, and so we talked about ways of	17	that's why it's more of a presumptive method of doing
18	getting me familiar with it. So he purchased a large	18	you need electron microscopy to pick up something
19	collection of different styles of wood. And so I took	19	because it's outside the optical limit of the light
20	the wood into the laboratory, and at this time it was a	20	microscopy.
21	laboratory that was over at Boynton Health Service, and	21	Q. Okay. And the light microscopy goes on yours, goes
22	we moved positions. And then I burned each different	22	up to only 60 times, right? A. That's as high as I choose to look at at the
23	kind of wood and then took an Air-O-Cell cassette	24	particular samples I look at, yes.
24	analysis or Air-O-Cell cassette sample close to the	25	Q. Okay. In terms of your lab analysis, do you do you
25	piece of wood. And then I looked at the resulting char	23	Q. Okay. In terms of your lab allalysis, do you do you
	Page 31		Page 33
1	Page 31 from the different styles of wood. So that gave me some	1	Page 33 analyze the Air-O-Cell cassette samples any differently
1 2		1 2	
	from the different styles of wood. So that gave me some		analyze the Air-O-Cell cassette samples any differently
2	from the different styles of wood. So that gave me some comfort level with respect to the variety of char styles	2	analyze the Air-O-Cell cassette samples any differently than tape samples?
2 3	from the different styles of wood. So that gave me some comfort level with respect to the variety of char styles I may anticipate seeing. So, after seeing a large	2	analyze the Air-O-Cell cassette samples any differently than tape samples? A. With respect to counts, it's slightly different. So the
2 3 4	from the different styles of wood. So that gave me some comfort level with respect to the variety of char styles I may anticipate seeing. So, after seeing a large number of them, I was able to to be comfortable with	2 3 4	analyze the Air-O-Cell cassette samples any differently than tape samples? A. With respect to counts, it's slightly different. So the Air-O-Cell cassette samples, typically there are at
2 3 4 5	from the different styles of wood. So that gave me some comfort level with respect to the variety of char styles I may anticipate seeing. So, after seeing a large number of them, I was able to to be comfortable with that analysis. Then, with respect to soot analysis, I	2 3 4 5	analyze the Air-O-Cell cassette samples any differently than tape samples? A. With respect to counts, it's slightly different. So the Air-O-Cell cassette samples, typically there are at 400x, there's typically approximately 25 fields from one
2 3 4 5 6	from the different styles of wood. So that gave me some comfort level with respect to the variety of char styles I may anticipate seeing. So, after seeing a large number of them, I was able to to be comfortable with that analysis. Then, with respect to soot analysis, I burned some other material, primarily material that	2 3 4 5 6	analyze the Air-O-Cell cassette samples any differently than tape samples? A. With respect to counts, it's slightly different. So the Air-O-Cell cassette samples, typically there are at 400x, there's typically approximately 25 fields from one end of the trace to the other. So, with respect to the
2 3 4 5 6 7	from the different styles of wood. So that gave me some comfort level with respect to the variety of char styles I may anticipate seeing. So, after seeing a large number of them, I was able to to be comfortable with that analysis. Then, with respect to soot analysis, I burned some other material, primarily material that produced a little bit better soot particle. The wood,	2 3 4 5 6	analyze the Air-O-Cell cassette samples any differently than tape samples? A. With respect to counts, it's slightly different. So the Air-O-Cell cassette samples, typically there are at 400x, there's typically approximately 25 fields from one end of the trace to the other. So, with respect to the number that's listed after like char or soot, that is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	from the different styles of wood. So that gave me some comfort level with respect to the variety of char styles I may anticipate seeing. So, after seeing a large number of them, I was able to to be comfortable with that analysis. Then, with respect to soot analysis, I burned some other material, primarily material that produced a little bit better soot particle. The wood, with the high temperature of burner, primarily produced	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	analyze the Air-O-Cell cassette samples any differently than tape samples? A. With respect to counts, it's slightly different. So the Air-O-Cell cassette samples, typically there are at 400x, there's typically approximately 25 fields from one end of the trace to the other. So, with respect to the number that's listed after like char or soot, that is the average number of that type of particles in that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	from the different styles of wood. So that gave me some comfort level with respect to the variety of char styles I may anticipate seeing. So, after seeing a large number of them, I was able to to be comfortable with that analysis. Then, with respect to soot analysis, I burned some other material, primarily material that produced a little bit better soot particle. The wood, with the high temperature of burner, primarily produced more char than soot. And then we also had some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	analyze the Air-O-Cell cassette samples any differently than tape samples? A. With respect to counts, it's slightly different. So the Air-O-Cell cassette samples, typically there are at 400x, there's typically approximately 25 fields from one end of the trace to the other. So, with respect to the number that's listed after like char or soot, that is the average number of that type of particles in that field. So, for instance, if I'll go along in in this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	from the different styles of wood. So that gave me some comfort level with respect to the variety of char styles I may anticipate seeing. So, after seeing a large number of them, I was able to to be comfortable with that analysis. Then, with respect to soot analysis, I burned some other material, primarily material that produced a little bit better soot particle. The wood, with the high temperature of burner, primarily produced more char than soot. And then we also had some electrical fires on campus that produced a large amount	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	analyze the Air-O-Cell cassette samples any differently than tape samples? A. With respect to counts, it's slightly different. So the Air-O-Cell cassette samples, typically there are at 400x, there's typically approximately 25 fields from one end of the trace to the other. So, with respect to the number that's listed after like char or soot, that is the average number of that type of particles in that field. So, for instance, if I'll go along in in this section, and it depends on how many that are there, if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	from the different styles of wood. So that gave me some comfort level with respect to the variety of char styles I may anticipate seeing. So, after seeing a large number of them, I was able to to be comfortable with that analysis. Then, with respect to soot analysis, I burned some other material, primarily material that produced a little bit better soot particle. The wood, with the high temperature of burner, primarily produced more char than soot. And then we also had some electrical fires on campus that produced a large amount of soot particles. And there's a YouTube video out	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	analyze the Air-O-Cell cassette samples any differently than tape samples? A. With respect to counts, it's slightly different. So the Air-O-Cell cassette samples, typically there are at 400x, there's typically approximately 25 fields from one end of the trace to the other. So, with respect to the number that's listed after like char or soot, that is the average number of that type of particles in that field. So, for instance, if I'll go along in in this section, and it depends on how many that are there, if it's a small number, then I will actually count the whole number of that type of particles from one end to the other and divide that number by 25 to get to get
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	from the different styles of wood. So that gave me some comfort level with respect to the variety of char styles I may anticipate seeing. So, after seeing a large number of them, I was able to to be comfortable with that analysis. Then, with respect to soot analysis, I burned some other material, primarily material that produced a little bit better soot particle. The wood, with the high temperature of burner, primarily produced more char than soot. And then we also had some electrical fires on campus that produced a large amount of soot particles. And there's a YouTube video out there that shows me taking a sample of that. Then I looked at the soot particles generated by that. And then also did online references. And I don't have the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	analyze the Air-O-Cell cassette samples any differently than tape samples? A. With respect to counts, it's slightly different. So the Air-O-Cell cassette samples, typically there are at 400x, there's typically approximately 25 fields from one end of the trace to the other. So, with respect to the number that's listed after like char or soot, that is the average number of that type of particles in that field. So, for instance, if I'll go along in in this section, and it depends on how many that are there, if it's a small number, then I will actually count the whole number of that type of particles from one end to the other and divide that number by 25 to get to get the number that's associated with this.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	from the different styles of wood. So that gave me some comfort level with respect to the variety of char styles I may anticipate seeing. So, after seeing a large number of them, I was able to to be comfortable with that analysis. Then, with respect to soot analysis, I burned some other material, primarily material that produced a little bit better soot particle. The wood, with the high temperature of burner, primarily produced more char than soot. And then we also had some electrical fires on campus that produced a large amount of soot particles. And there's a YouTube video out there that shows me taking a sample of that. Then I looked at the soot particles generated by that. And then also did online references. And I don't have the specific ones for you, but looking at here's how soot	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	analyze the Air-O-Cell cassette samples any differently than tape samples? A. With respect to counts, it's slightly different. So the Air-O-Cell cassette samples, typically there are at 400x, there's typically approximately 25 fields from one end of the trace to the other. So, with respect to the number that's listed after like char or soot, that is the average number of that type of particles in that field. So, for instance, if I'll go along in in this section, and it depends on how many that are there, if it's a small number, then I will actually count the whole number of that type of particles from one end to the other and divide that number by 25 to get to get the number that's associated with this. So, in other words, if I find 25 particles of char
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	from the different styles of wood. So that gave me some comfort level with respect to the variety of char styles I may anticipate seeing. So, after seeing a large number of them, I was able to to be comfortable with that analysis. Then, with respect to soot analysis, I burned some other material, primarily material that produced a little bit better soot particle. The wood, with the high temperature of burner, primarily produced more char than soot. And then we also had some electrical fires on campus that produced a large amount of soot particles. And there's a YouTube video out there that shows me taking a sample of that. Then I looked at the soot particles generated by that. And then also did online references. And I don't have the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	analyze the Air-O-Cell cassette samples any differently than tape samples? A. With respect to counts, it's slightly different. So the Air-O-Cell cassette samples, typically there are at 400x, there's typically approximately 25 fields from one end of the trace to the other. So, with respect to the number that's listed after like char or soot, that is the average number of that type of particles in that field. So, for instance, if I'll go along in in this section, and it depends on how many that are there, if it's a small number, then I will actually count the whole number of that type of particles from one end to the other and divide that number by 25 to get to get the number that's associated with this. So, in other words, if I find 25 particles of char all the way through that whole trace, then the answer
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	from the different styles of wood. So that gave me some comfort level with respect to the variety of char styles I may anticipate seeing. So, after seeing a large number of them, I was able to to be comfortable with that analysis. Then, with respect to soot analysis, I burned some other material, primarily material that produced a little bit better soot particle. The wood, with the high temperature of burner, primarily produced more char than soot. And then we also had some electrical fires on campus that produced a large amount of soot particles. And there's a YouTube video out there that shows me taking a sample of that. Then I looked at the soot particles generated by that. And then also did online references. And I don't have the specific ones for you, but looking at here's how soot particles present and how they compare to some other particles that are somewhat similar.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	analyze the Air-O-Cell cassette samples any differently than tape samples? A. With respect to counts, it's slightly different. So the Air-O-Cell cassette samples, typically there are at 400x, there's typically approximately 25 fields from one end of the trace to the other. So, with respect to the number that's listed after like char or soot, that is the average number of that type of particles in that field. So, for instance, if I'll go along in in this section, and it depends on how many that are there, if it's a small number, then I will actually count the whole number of that type of particles from one end to the other and divide that number by 25 to get to get the number that's associated with this. So, in other words, if I find 25 particles of char all the way through that whole trace, then the answer would be one, because there's one particle per field.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	from the different styles of wood. So that gave me some comfort level with respect to the variety of char styles I may anticipate seeing. So, after seeing a large number of them, I was able to to be comfortable with that analysis. Then, with respect to soot analysis, I burned some other material, primarily material that produced a little bit better soot particle. The wood, with the high temperature of burner, primarily produced more char than soot. And then we also had some electrical fires on campus that produced a large amount of soot particles. And there's a YouTube video out there that shows me taking a sample of that. Then I looked at the soot particles generated by that. And then also did online references. And I don't have the specific ones for you, but looking at here's how soot particles present and how they compare to some other particles that are somewhat similar.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	analyze the Air-O-Cell cassette samples any differently than tape samples? A. With respect to counts, it's slightly different. So the Air-O-Cell cassette samples, typically there are at 400x, there's typically approximately 25 fields from one end of the trace to the other. So, with respect to the number that's listed after like char or soot, that is the average number of that type of particles in that field. So, for instance, if I'll go along in in this section, and it depends on how many that are there, if it's a small number, then I will actually count the whole number of that type of particles from one end to the other and divide that number by 25 to get to get the number that's associated with this. So, in other words, if I find 25 particles of char all the way through that whole trace, then the answer would be one, because there's one particle per field. Let's see here.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	from the different styles of wood. So that gave me some comfort level with respect to the variety of char styles I may anticipate seeing. So, after seeing a large number of them, I was able to to be comfortable with that analysis. Then, with respect to soot analysis, I burned some other material, primarily material that produced a little bit better soot particle. The wood, with the high temperature of burner, primarily produced more char than soot. And then we also had some electrical fires on campus that produced a large amount of soot particles. And there's a YouTube video out there that shows me taking a sample of that. Then I looked at the soot particles generated by that. And then also did online references. And I don't have the specific ones for you, but looking at here's how soot particles present and how they compare to some other particles that are somewhat similar. Q. Have you ever received any training from any third parties as to how to visually differentiate between soot	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	analyze the Air-O-Cell cassette samples any differently than tape samples? A. With respect to counts, it's slightly different. So the Air-O-Cell cassette samples, typically there are at 400x, there's typically approximately 25 fields from one end of the trace to the other. So, with respect to the number that's listed after like char or soot, that is the average number of that type of particles in that field. So, for instance, if I'll go along in in this section, and it depends on how many that are there, if it's a small number, then I will actually count the whole number of that type of particles from one end to the other and divide that number by 25 to get to get the number that's associated with this. So, in other words, if I find 25 particles of char all the way through that whole trace, then the answer would be one, because there's one particle per field. Let's see here. Q. So just so I have that clear then, so like if we look at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	from the different styles of wood. So that gave me some comfort level with respect to the variety of char styles I may anticipate seeing. So, after seeing a large number of them, I was able to to be comfortable with that analysis. Then, with respect to soot analysis, I burned some other material, primarily material that produced a little bit better soot particle. The wood, with the high temperature of burner, primarily produced more char than soot. And then we also had some electrical fires on campus that produced a large amount of soot particles. And there's a YouTube video out there that shows me taking a sample of that. Then I looked at the soot particles generated by that. And then also did online references. And I don't have the specific ones for you, but looking at here's how soot particles present and how they compare to some other particles that are somewhat similar. Q. Have you ever received any training from any third parties as to how to visually differentiate between soot and char particles?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	analyze the Air-O-Cell cassette samples any differently than tape samples? A. With respect to counts, it's slightly different. So the Air-O-Cell cassette samples, typically there are at 400x, there's typically approximately 25 fields from one end of the trace to the other. So, with respect to the number that's listed after like char or soot, that is the average number of that type of particles in that field. So, for instance, if I'll go along in in this section, and it depends on how many that are there, if it's a small number, then I will actually count the whole number of that type of particles from one end to the other and divide that number by 25 to get to get the number that's associated with this. So, in other words, if I find 25 particles of char all the way through that whole trace, then the answer would be one, because there's one particle per field. Let's see here. Q. So just so I have that clear then, so like if we look at the report that's marked as Exhibit 2 as an example
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	from the different styles of wood. So that gave me some comfort level with respect to the variety of char styles I may anticipate seeing. So, after seeing a large number of them, I was able to to be comfortable with that analysis. Then, with respect to soot analysis, I burned some other material, primarily material that produced a little bit better soot particle. The wood, with the high temperature of burner, primarily produced more char than soot. And then we also had some electrical fires on campus that produced a large amount of soot particles. And there's a YouTube video out there that shows me taking a sample of that. Then I looked at the soot particles generated by that. And then also did online references. And I don't have the specific ones for you, but looking at here's how soot particles present and how they compare to some other particles that are somewhat similar. Q. Have you ever received any training from any third parties as to how to visually differentiate between soot and char particles? A. Not the not no no in-person third-party	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	analyze the Air-O-Cell cassette samples any differently than tape samples? A. With respect to counts, it's slightly different. So the Air-O-Cell cassette samples, typically there are at 400x, there's typically approximately 25 fields from one end of the trace to the other. So, with respect to the number that's listed after like char or soot, that is the average number of that type of particles in that field. So, for instance, if I'll go along in in this section, and it depends on how many that are there, if it's a small number, then I will actually count the whole number of that type of particles from one end to the other and divide that number by 25 to get to get the number that's associated with this. So, in other words, if I find 25 particles of char all the way through that whole trace, then the answer would be one, because there's one particle per field. Let's see here. Q. So just so I have that clear then, so like if we look at the report that's marked as Exhibit 2 as an example A. Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	from the different styles of wood. So that gave me some comfort level with respect to the variety of char styles I may anticipate seeing. So, after seeing a large number of them, I was able to to be comfortable with that analysis. Then, with respect to soot analysis, I burned some other material, primarily material that produced a little bit better soot particle. The wood, with the high temperature of burner, primarily produced more char than soot. And then we also had some electrical fires on campus that produced a large amount of soot particles. And there's a YouTube video out there that shows me taking a sample of that. Then I looked at the soot particles generated by that. And then also did online references. And I don't have the specific ones for you, but looking at here's how soot particles present and how they compare to some other particles that are somewhat similar. Q. Have you ever received any training from any third parties as to how to visually differentiate between soot and char particles? A. Not the not no no in-person third-party training. No.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	analyze the Air-O-Cell cassette samples any differently than tape samples? A. With respect to counts, it's slightly different. So the Air-O-Cell cassette samples, typically there are at 400x, there's typically approximately 25 fields from one end of the trace to the other. So, with respect to the number that's listed after like char or soot, that is the average number of that type of particles in that field. So, for instance, if I'll go along in in this section, and it depends on how many that are there, if it's a small number, then I will actually count the whole number of that type of particles from one end to the other and divide that number by 25 to get to get the number that's associated with this. So, in other words, if I find 25 particles of char all the way through that whole trace, then the answer would be one, because there's one particle per field. Let's see here. Q. So just so I have that clear then, so like if we look at the report that's marked as Exhibit 2 as an example A. Right. Q we have sample number 9, Room 412, dividing CMU. Do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	from the different styles of wood. So that gave me some comfort level with respect to the variety of char styles I may anticipate seeing. So, after seeing a large number of them, I was able to to be comfortable with that analysis. Then, with respect to soot analysis, I burned some other material, primarily material that produced a little bit better soot particle. The wood, with the high temperature of burner, primarily produced more char than soot. And then we also had some electrical fires on campus that produced a large amount of soot particles. And there's a YouTube video out there that shows me taking a sample of that. Then I looked at the soot particles generated by that. And then also did online references. And I don't have the specific ones for you, but looking at here's how soot particles present and how they compare to some other particles that are somewhat similar. Q. Have you ever received any training from any third parties as to how to visually differentiate between soot and char particles? A. Not the not no no in-person third-party training. No. Q. Okay. How does the appearance of char and soot	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	analyze the Air-O-Cell cassette samples any differently than tape samples? A. With respect to counts, it's slightly different. So the Air-O-Cell cassette samples, typically there are at 400x, there's typically approximately 25 fields from one end of the trace to the other. So, with respect to the number that's listed after like char or soot, that is the average number of that type of particles in that field. So, for instance, if I'll go along in in this section, and it depends on how many that are there, if it's a small number, then I will actually count the whole number of that type of particles from one end to the other and divide that number by 25 to get to get the number that's associated with this. So, in other words, if I find 25 particles of char all the way through that whole trace, then the answer would be one, because there's one particle per field. Let's see here. Q. So just so I have that clear then, so like if we look at the report that's marked as Exhibit 2 as an example A. Right. Q we have sample number 9, Room 412, dividing CMU. Do you see that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	from the different styles of wood. So that gave me some comfort level with respect to the variety of char styles I may anticipate seeing. So, after seeing a large number of them, I was able to to be comfortable with that analysis. Then, with respect to soot analysis, I burned some other material, primarily material that produced a little bit better soot particle. The wood, with the high temperature of burner, primarily produced more char than soot. And then we also had some electrical fires on campus that produced a large amount of soot particles. And there's a YouTube video out there that shows me taking a sample of that. Then I looked at the soot particles generated by that. And then also did online references. And I don't have the specific ones for you, but looking at here's how soot particles present and how they compare to some other particles that are somewhat similar. Q. Have you ever received any training from any third parties as to how to visually differentiate between soot and char particles? A. Not the not no no in-person third-party training. No.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	analyze the Air-O-Cell cassette samples any differently than tape samples? A. With respect to counts, it's slightly different. So the Air-O-Cell cassette samples, typically there are at 400x, there's typically approximately 25 fields from one end of the trace to the other. So, with respect to the number that's listed after like char or soot, that is the average number of that type of particles in that field. So, for instance, if I'll go along in in this section, and it depends on how many that are there, if it's a small number, then I will actually count the whole number of that type of particles from one end to the other and divide that number by 25 to get to get the number that's associated with this. So, in other words, if I find 25 particles of char all the way through that whole trace, then the answer would be one, because there's one particle per field. Let's see here. Q. So just so I have that clear then, so like if we look at the report that's marked as Exhibit 2 as an example A. Right. Q we have sample number 9, Room 412, dividing CMU. Do

	Page 34		Page 36
1	A. Yes.	1	that more or less than 1 square millimeter field?
2	Q. Does that mean that's 1 to 2 particles per field that	2	A. It would be less.
3	you observed?	3	Q. Okay. Looking at Exhibit 2, my understanding is that
4	A. That's correct, yes.	4	the notation Asp/Pen heavy, that's a reference to mold
5	Q. And what is the size of that field?	5	spores, correct?
6	A. The size of the field is the size of the field	6	A. Yes. It's it's a reference to Asp/Pen mold spores.
7	circumscribed by the 400x. I can give you a rough	7	The reason why it's designated Asp/Pen is the spores are
8	estimate of the size. It's approximately well, I	8	similar to those produced by an aspergillus or
9	would have to I'd have to measure it out with a	9	penicillium organism, but using this technique with the
10	micrometer. It's approximately do my diameters	10	tape, it's unable to differentiate between the two.
11	right. I think it's I'm going to give you	11	That's why it's referred to Asp/Pen.
12	approximate range between 150 and 200 micrometers in	12	Q. Unable to differentiate between the aspergillus and
13	diameter.	13	penicillium?
14	QiiOkay. And how about in terms my my math is not as	14	A. That is correct. Yes, sir.
15	good as yours. Can you express that in square	15	Q. All right. So you've in Room 407, interior wall, the
16	millimeters?	16	first sample that you analyze here on Exhibit 2, this is
17	A. Well, let's see. I'd have to take it times pi.	17	a Days Inn, you noted that Asp/Pen was heavy, correct?
18	Q. Okay	18	A. Yes.
19	A. Let's say I can do the radius. Let's say the radius is	19	Q. Do you know how many particles per field there were?
20	roughly 100. It's not a very big one as far as	20	A. That one I don't typically measure in particles per
21	millimeters. It's micrometers. So do you really need	21	field. If I if I may refer to the interpretation on
22	it? I mean we can	22	let's see if I've got one in this one. This one
23	Q. No, I don't need an exact answer	23	actually okay. I usually have a fungal
24	A. Okay.	21	interpretation. This one I don't. The typical fungal
25	Q. And if you don't have a reasonable approximation,	25	interpretation is if I see fungal growth, so actual
	Daga 25		
	Page 35		Page 37
1	there's no need to stop and figure it out.	1	Page 37 growth of a of organisms or a large number of fungal
1 2		1 2	
	there's no need to stop and figure it out.	1	growth of a of organisms or a large number of fungal
2	there's no need to stop and figure it out. A. Yeah.	2	growth of a of organisms or a large number of fungal spores. But in this particular case the primarily
2	there's no need to stop and figure it out. A. Yeah. Q. But is it after you've looked strike that.	2	growth of a of organisms or a large number of fungal spores. But in this particular case the primarily primary analysis is focused on the soot and char; not so
2 3 4	there's no need to stop and figure it out. A. Yeah. Q. But is it after you've looked strike that. Excuse me. For the record, I just had to stop and	2 3 4	growth of a of organisms or a large number of fungal spores. But in this particular case the primarily primary analysis is focused on the soot and char; not so much in that. If I'm doing a specific fungal analysis,
2 3 4 5	there's no need to stop and figure it out. A. Yeah. Q. But is it after you've looked strike that. Excuse me. For the record, I just had to stop and take a drink of water.	2 3 4 5	growth of a of organisms or a large number of fungal spores. But in this particular case the primarily primary analysis is focused on the soot and char; not so much in that. If I'm doing a specific fungal analysis, then I'll give you actual spores per cubic meter, but I
2 3 4 5 6	there's no need to stop and figure it out. A. Yeah. Q. But is it after you've looked strike that. Excuse me. For the record, I just had to stop and take a drink of water. When you're analyzing the tape samples or the	2 3 4 5	growth of a of organisms or a large number of fungal spores. But in this particular case the primarily primary analysis is focused on the soot and char; not so much in that. If I'm doing a specific fungal analysis, then I'll give you actual spores per cubic meter, but I didn't do that in this case.
2 3 4 5 6 7	there's no need to stop and figure it out. A. Yeah. Q. But is it after you've looked strike that. Excuse me. For the record, I just had to stop and take a drink of water. When you're analyzing the tape samples or the Air-O-Cell samples, do you look at the entire field?	2 3 4 5 6 7	growth of a of organisms or a large number of fungal spores. But in this particular case the primarily primary analysis is focused on the soot and char; not so much in that. If I'm doing a specific fungal analysis, then I'll give you actual spores per cubic meter, but I didn't do that in this case. Q. Okay. As you sit here today, we have no idea what the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	there's no need to stop and figure it out. A. Yeah. Q. But is it after you've looked strike that. Excuse me. For the record, I just had to stop and take a drink of water. When you're analyzing the tape samples or the Air-O-Cell samples, do you look at the entire field? A. As much as I can. In some cases, for instance, if I may	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	growth of a of organisms or a large number of fungal spores. But in this particular case the primarily primary analysis is focused on the soot and char; not so much in that. If I'm doing a specific fungal analysis, then I'll give you actual spores per cubic meter, but I didn't do that in this case. Q. Okay. As you sit here today, we have no idea what the spores per cubic millimeter of mold spores was, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	there's no need to stop and figure it out. A. Yeah. Q. But is it after you've looked strike that. Excuse me. For the record, I just had to stop and take a drink of water. When you're analyzing the tape samples or the Air-O-Cell samples, do you look at the entire field? A. As much as I can. In some cases, for instance, if I may refer to this, I think there's one. For instance, there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	growth of a of organisms or a large number of fungal spores. But in this particular case the primarily primary analysis is focused on the soot and char; not so much in that. If I'm doing a specific fungal analysis, then I'll give you actual spores per cubic meter, but I didn't do that in this case. Q. Okay. As you sit here today, we have no idea what the spores per cubic millimeter of mold spores was, correct? A. No, I don't have a specific one.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	there's no need to stop and figure it out. A. Yeah. Q. But is it after you've looked strike that. Excuse me. For the record, I just had to stop and take a drink of water. When you're analyzing the tape samples or the Air-O-Cell samples, do you look at the entire field? A. As much as I can. In some cases, for instance, if I may refer to this, I think there's one. For instance, there was a tease tape sample that had char of 50 plus. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	growth of a of organisms or a large number of fungal spores. But in this particular case the primarily primary analysis is focused on the soot and char; not so much in that. If I'm doing a specific fungal analysis, then I'll give you actual spores per cubic meter, but I didn't do that in this case. Q. Okay. As you sit here today, we have no idea what the spores per cubic millimeter of mold spores was, correct? A. No, I don't have a specific one. Q. Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	there's no need to stop and figure it out. A. Yeah. Q. But is it after you've looked strike that. Excuse me. For the record, I just had to stop and take a drink of water. When you're analyzing the tape samples or the Air-O-Cell samples, do you look at the entire field? A. As much as I can. In some cases, for instance, if I may refer to this, I think there's one. For instance, there was a tease tape sample that had char of 50 plus. I would look probably at the field, kind of zoom in a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	growth of a of organisms or a large number of fungal spores. But in this particular case the primarily primary analysis is focused on the soot and char; not so much in that. If I'm doing a specific fungal analysis, then I'll give you actual spores per cubic meter, but I didn't do that in this case. Q. Okay. As you sit here today, we have no idea what the spores per cubic millimeter of mold spores was, correct? A. No, I don't have a specific one. Q. Okay. A. In that it's based on past experience, it looked like
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	there's no need to stop and figure it out. A. Yeah. Q. But is it after you've looked strike that. Excuse me. For the record, I just had to stop and take a drink of water. When you're analyzing the tape samples or the Air-O-Cell samples, do you look at the entire field? A. As much as I can. In some cases, for instance, if I may refer to this, I think there's one. For instance, there was a tease tape sample that had char of 50 plus. I would look probably at the field, kind of zoom in a couple spots, but, if it's essentially opaque, I'm not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	growth of a of organisms or a large number of fungal spores. But in this particular case the primarily primary analysis is focused on the soot and char; not so much in that. If I'm doing a specific fungal analysis, then I'll give you actual spores per cubic meter, but I didn't do that in this case. Q. Okay. As you sit here today, we have no idea what the spores per cubic millimeter of mold spores was, correct? A. No, I don't have a specific one. Q. Okay. A. In that it's based on past experience, it looked like there was a significant number that and when I do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	there's no need to stop and figure it out. A. Yeah. Q. But is it after you've looked strike that. Excuse me. For the record, I just had to stop and take a drink of water. When you're analyzing the tape samples or the Air-O-Cell samples, do you look at the entire field? A. As much as I can. In some cases, for instance, if I may refer to this, I think there's one. For instance, there was a tease tape sample that had char of 50 plus. I would look probably at the field, kind of zoom in a couple spots, but, if it's essentially opaque, I'm not going to go into every one that looks like there's a lot	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	growth of a of organisms or a large number of fungal spores. But in this particular case the primarily primary analysis is focused on the soot and char; not so much in that. If I'm doing a specific fungal analysis, then I'll give you actual spores per cubic meter, but I didn't do that in this case. Q. Okay. As you sit here today, we have no idea what the spores per cubic millimeter of mold spores was, correct? A. No, I don't have a specific one. Q. Okay. A. In that it's based on past experience, it looked like there was a significant number that and when I do that, it just when I make this notation, it's just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there's no need to stop and figure it out. A. Yeah. Q. But is it after you've looked strike that. Excuse me. For the record, I just had to stop and take a drink of water. When you're analyzing the tape samples or the Air-O-Cell samples, do you look at the entire field? A. As much as I can. In some cases, for instance, if I may refer to this, I think there's one. For instance, there was a tease tape sample that had char of 50 plus. I would look probably at the field, kind of zoom in a couple spots, but, if it's essentially opaque, I'm not going to go into every one that looks like there's a lot of problems. If there's a really low count, then I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	growth of a of organisms or a large number of fungal spores. But in this particular case the primarily primary analysis is focused on the soot and char; not so much in that. If I'm doing a specific fungal analysis, then I'll give you actual spores per cubic meter, but I didn't do that in this case. Q. Okay. As you sit here today, we have no idea what the spores per cubic millimeter of mold spores was, correct? A. No, I don't have a specific one. Q. Okay. A. In that it's based on past experience, it looked like there was a significant number that and when I do that, it just when I make this notation, it's just suggesting that when the person is looking at the spot
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	there's no need to stop and figure it out. A. Yeah. Q. But is it after you've looked strike that. Excuse me. For the record, I just had to stop and take a drink of water. When you're analyzing the tape samples or the Air-O-Cell samples, do you look at the entire field? A. As much as I can. In some cases, for instance, if I may refer to this, I think there's one. For instance, there was a tease tape sample that had char of 50 plus. I would look probably at the field, kind of zoom in a couple spots, but, if it's essentially opaque, I'm not going to go into every one that looks like there's a lot of problems. If there's a really low count, then I'm going to have to go through the whole field to make sure	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	growth of a of organisms or a large number of fungal spores. But in this particular case the primarily primary analysis is focused on the soot and char; not so much in that. If I'm doing a specific fungal analysis, then I'll give you actual spores per cubic meter, but I didn't do that in this case. Q. Okay. As you sit here today, we have no idea what the spores per cubic millimeter of mold spores was, correct? A. No, I don't have a specific one. Q. Okay. A. In that it's based on past experience, it looked like there was a significant number that and when I do that, it just when I make this notation, it's just suggesting that when the person is looking at the spot that there may be an internal source for that organism
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there's no need to stop and figure it out. A. Yeah. Q. But is it after you've looked strike that. Excuse me. For the record, I just had to stop and take a drink of water. When you're analyzing the tape samples or the Air-O-Cell samples, do you look at the entire field? A. As much as I can. In some cases, for instance, if I may refer to this, I think there's one. For instance, there was a tease tape sample that had char of 50 plus. I would look probably at the field, kind of zoom in a couple spots, but, if it's essentially opaque, I'm not going to go into every one that looks like there's a lot of problems. If there's a really low count, then I'm going to have to go through the whole field to make sure I'm because I'm looking for a needle in a haystack essentially. Q. Okay. So, in terms of the field size that this is, we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	growth of a of organisms or a large number of fungal spores. But in this particular case the primarily primary analysis is focused on the soot and char; not so much in that. If I'm doing a specific fungal analysis, then I'll give you actual spores per cubic meter, but I didn't do that in this case. Q. Okay. As you sit here today, we have no idea what the spores per cubic millimeter of mold spores was, correct? A. No, I don't have a specific one. Q. Okay. A. In that it's based on past experience, it looked like there was a significant number that and when I do that, it just when I make this notation, it's just suggesting that when the person is looking at the spot that there may be an internal source for that organism in that space. And typically they'll follow up and try to figure out where that is or what's what's the problem.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there's no need to stop and figure it out. A. Yeah. Q. But is it after you've looked strike that. Excuse me. For the record, I just had to stop and take a drink of water. When you're analyzing the tape samples or the Air-O-Cell samples, do you look at the entire field? A. As much as I can. In some cases, for instance, if I may refer to this, I think there's one. For instance, there was a tease tape sample that had char of 50 plus. I would look probably at the field, kind of zoom in a couple spots, but, if it's essentially opaque, I'm not going to go into every one that looks like there's a lot of problems. If there's a really low count, then I'm going to have to go through the whole field to make sure I'm because I'm looking for a needle in a haystack essentially. Q. Okay. So, in terms of the field size that this is, we use number 9 as an example, char 1 to 2 particles,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	growth of a of organisms or a large number of fungal spores. But in this particular case the primarily primary analysis is focused on the soot and char; not so much in that. If I'm doing a specific fungal analysis, then I'll give you actual spores per cubic meter, but I didn't do that in this case. Q. Okay. As you sit here today, we have no idea what the spores per cubic millimeter of mold spores was, correct? A. No, I don't have a specific one. Q. Okay. A. In that it's based on past experience, it looked like there was a significant number that and when I do that, it just when I make this notation, it's just suggesting that when the person is looking at the spot that there may be an internal source for that organism in that space. And typically they'll follow up and try to figure out where that is or what's what's the problem. Q. Okay. So on the sample number 1, Room 407, interior
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	there's no need to stop and figure it out. A. Yeah. Q. But is it after you've looked strike that. Excuse me. For the record, I just had to stop and take a drink of water. When you're analyzing the tape samples or the Air-O-Cell samples, do you look at the entire field? A. As much as I can. In some cases, for instance, if I may refer to this, I think there's one. For instance, there was a tease tape sample that had char of 50 plus. I would look probably at the field, kind of zoom in a couple spots, but, if it's essentially opaque, I'm not going to go into every one that looks like there's a lot of problems. If there's a really low count, then I'm going to have to go through the whole field to make sure I'm because I'm looking for a needle in a haystack essentially. Q. Okay. So, in terms of the field size that this is, we use number 9 as an example, char 1 to 2 particles, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	growth of a of organisms or a large number of fungal spores. But in this particular case the primarily primary analysis is focused on the soot and char; not so much in that. If I'm doing a specific fungal analysis, then I'll give you actual spores per cubic meter, but I didn't do that in this case. Q. Okay. As you sit here today, we have no idea what the spores per cubic millimeter of mold spores was, correct? A. No, I don't have a specific one. Q. Okay. A. In that it's based on past experience, it looked like there was a significant number that and when I do that, it just when I make this notation, it's just suggesting that when the person is looking at the spot that there may be an internal source for that organism in that space. And typically they'll follow up and try to figure out where that is or what's what's the problem. Q. Okay. So on the sample number 1, Room 407, interior wall, what was the proportion of mold spores that you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	there's no need to stop and figure it out. A. Yeah. Q. But is it after you've looked strike that. Excuse me. For the record, I just had to stop and take a drink of water. When you're analyzing the tape samples or the Air-O-Cell samples, do you look at the entire field? A. As much as I can. In some cases, for instance, if I may refer to this, I think there's one. For instance, there was a tease tape sample that had char of 50 plus. I would look probably at the field, kind of zoom in a couple spots, but, if it's essentially opaque, I'm not going to go into every one that looks like there's a lot of problems. If there's a really low count, then I'm going to have to go through the whole field to make sure I'm because I'm looking for a needle in a haystack essentially. Q. Okay. So, in terms of the field size that this is, we use number 9 as an example, char 1 to 2 particles, correct? A. Yeah.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	growth of a of organisms or a large number of fungal spores. But in this particular case the primarily primary analysis is focused on the soot and char; not so much in that. If I'm doing a specific fungal analysis, then I'll give you actual spores per cubic meter, but I didn't do that in this case. Q. Okay. As you sit here today, we have no idea what the spores per cubic millimeter of mold spores was, correct? A. No, I don't have a specific one. Q. Okay. A. In that it's based on past experience, it looked like there was a significant number that and when I do that, it just when I make this notation, it's just suggesting that when the person is looking at the spot that there may be an internal source for that organism in that space. And typically they'll follow up and try to figure out where that is or what's what's the problem. Q. Okay. So on the sample number 1, Room 407, interior wall, what was the proportion of mold spores that you observed to char and soot particles?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	there's no need to stop and figure it out. A. Yeah. Q. But is it after you've looked strike that. Excuse me. For the record, I just had to stop and take a drink of water. When you're analyzing the tape samples or the Air-O-Cell samples, do you look at the entire field? A. As much as I can. In some cases, for instance, if I may refer to this, I think there's one. For instance, there was a tease tape sample that had char of 50 plus. I would look probably at the field, kind of zoom in a couple spots, but, if it's essentially opaque, I'm not going to go into every one that looks like there's a lot of problems. If there's a really low count, then I'm going to have to go through the whole field to make sure I'm because I'm looking for a needle in a haystack essentially. Q. Okay. So, in terms of the field size that this is, we use number 9 as an example, char 1 to 2 particles, correct? A. Yeah. Q. And that's expressed as 1 or 2 particles per field that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	growth of a of organisms or a large number of fungal spores. But in this particular case the primarily primary analysis is focused on the soot and char; not so much in that. If I'm doing a specific fungal analysis, then I'll give you actual spores per cubic meter, but I didn't do that in this case. Q. Okay. As you sit here today, we have no idea what the spores per cubic millimeter of mold spores was, correct? A. No, I don't have a specific one. Q. Okay. A. In that it's based on past experience, it looked like there was a significant number that and when I do that, it just when I make this notation, it's just suggesting that when the person is looking at the spot that there may be an internal source for that organism in that space. And typically they'll follow up and try to figure out where that is or what's what's the problem. Q. Okay. So on the sample number 1, Room 407, interior wall, what was the proportion of mold spores that you observed to char and soot particles? A. I won't give you a I can't give you an exact one, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	there's no need to stop and figure it out. A. Yeah. Q. But is it after you've looked strike that. Excuse me. For the record, I just had to stop and take a drink of water. When you're analyzing the tape samples or the Air-O-Cell samples, do you look at the entire field? A. As much as I can. In some cases, for instance, if I may refer to this, I think there's one. For instance, there was a tease tape sample that had char of 50 plus. I would look probably at the field, kind of zoom in a couple spots, but, if it's essentially opaque, I'm not going to go into every one that looks like there's a lot of problems. If there's a really low count, then I'm going to have to go through the whole field to make sure I'm because I'm looking for a needle in a haystack essentially. Q. Okay. So, in terms of the field size that this is, we use number 9 as an example, char 1 to 2 particles, correct? A. Yeah. Q. And that's expressed as 1 or 2 particles per field that you're viewing under the microscope, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	growth of a of organisms or a large number of fungal spores. But in this particular case the primarily primary analysis is focused on the soot and char; not so much in that. If I'm doing a specific fungal analysis, then I'll give you actual spores per cubic meter, but I didn't do that in this case. Q. Okay. As you sit here today, we have no idea what the spores per cubic millimeter of mold spores was, correct? A. No, I don't have a specific one. Q. Okay. A. In that it's based on past experience, it looked like there was a significant number that and when I do that, it just when I make this notation, it's just suggesting that when the person is looking at the spot that there may be an internal source for that organism in that space. And typically they'll follow up and try to figure out where that is or what's what's the problem. Q. Okay. So on the sample number 1, Room 407, interior wall, what was the proportion of mold spores that you observed to char and soot particles? A. I won't give you a I can't give you an exact one, but I would say let's see. If I'm looking at maybe a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	there's no need to stop and figure it out. A. Yeah. Q. But is it after you've looked strike that. Excuse me. For the record, I just had to stop and take a drink of water. When you're analyzing the tape samples or the Air-O-Cell samples, do you look at the entire field? A. As much as I can. In some cases, for instance, if I may refer to this, I think there's one. For instance, there was a tease tape sample that had char of 50 plus. I would look probably at the field, kind of zoom in a couple spots, but, if it's essentially opaque, I'm not going to go into every one that looks like there's a lot of problems. If there's a really low count, then I'm going to have to go through the whole field to make sure I'm because I'm looking for a needle in a haystack essentially. Q. Okay. So, in terms of the field size that this is, we use number 9 as an example, char 1 to 2 particles, correct? A. Yeah. Q. And that's expressed as 1 or 2 particles per field that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	growth of a of organisms or a large number of fungal spores. But in this particular case the primarily primary analysis is focused on the soot and char; not so much in that. If I'm doing a specific fungal analysis, then I'll give you actual spores per cubic meter, but I didn't do that in this case. Q. Okay. As you sit here today, we have no idea what the spores per cubic millimeter of mold spores was, correct? A. No, I don't have a specific one. Q. Okay. A. In that it's based on past experience, it looked like there was a significant number that and when I do that, it just when I make this notation, it's just suggesting that when the person is looking at the spot that there may be an internal source for that organism in that space. And typically they'll follow up and try to figure out where that is or what's what's the problem. Q. Okay. So on the sample number 1, Room 407, interior wall, what was the proportion of mold spores that you observed to char and soot particles? A. I won't give you a I can't give you an exact one, but

	D200 20		Page 40
	Page 38		_
1	unit of the char and soot?	1	looking through and I can see fairly clearly. For a
2	A. Yeah. Since the char and soot are negligible there.	2	heavy one I would see almost a matte of particles, and
3	Q. Okay	3	that would make it more difficult for me to see, to
4	A. There's not very many. So it would be primarily those.	4	determine the particles that are are are present
5	And I'm ball-parking it with respect to 1,000.	5	and do an identification on.
6	Q. Sure. You've got Asp/Pen noted at moderate to light	6	Q. Okay. Let's move. Just past that table there's a Char
7	down here on sample 10. Can you tell me what range of	7	and soot-like particle interpretation section there. Do
8	spores is moderate to light?	8	you see that?
9	A. I would and I'm again, I'm going to give you a	9	A. Yes.
10	ballpark, but I would say somewhere between 10 and maybe	10	Q. Where does that table come from?
11	75, or something like that.	11	A. That one was and I can't I don't recall the exact
12	Q. All right,	12	place it was from. I think Tom Irmiter may be able to
13	A. Per for that whole trace.	13	help you answer that question.
14	Q. And that's particles per field, right?	14	Q. Okay. So, as you sit here today, you don't know where
15	A. No. That would be if you're looking at that more of	15	this table came from?
16	particles per per cubic meter.	16	A. I don't remember. I don't recall exactly where it came
17	Q. Okay	17	from, but I recall somehow looking through some other
18	A. And in these samples there are 30-liter samples. So	18	reports and finding that this seemed to be more or less
19	$Q_{\scriptscriptstyle{+}}$ Do you have any opinion on whether air samples or	19	a way that people were looking at it. It is similar to
20	surface samples are more reliable?	20	what as far as interpretation, I don't think it's
21	A. I'll say in some cases it depends. It's easier to get	21	there, but the EMLab P&K seminar on it did have
22	recovery from a surface sample than it is from an air	22	subrogations based on that that were fairly similar to
23	sample because the air samples tend to be variable and	23	this. So I would say that would probably be close to.
24	are affected a lot more by let's say a disturbance in	24	Q. That kind of brings me to my next question. Is there a
25	the environment, and there's a lot more variables. So	25	generally accepted particle count that constitutes, you
	Page 39		
	rage 33		Page 41
1		1	Page 41 know, negligible, limited, moderate, or significant, or
1 2	I've taken samples in, let's say, a half hour apart, and	1 2	
1 2 3			know, negligible, limited, moderate, or significant, or
2	I've taken samples in, let's say, a half hour apart, and it's been very different. So there's a lot of variability associated with the air samples. With a	2	know, negligible, limited, moderate, or significant, or major?
2	I've taken samples in, let's say, a half hour apart, and it's been very different. So there's a lot of	2	know, negligible, limited, moderate, or significant, or major? A. I think there's general agreement on the major part of
2 3 4	I've taken samples in, let's say, a half hour apart, and it's been very different. So there's a lot of variability associated with the air samples. With a surface sample, it tends to be less variable.	2 3 4	know, negligible, limited, moderate, or significant, or major? A. I think there's general agreement on the major part of it. In other words, if they're the way that this is
2 3 4 5	I've taken samples in, let's say, a half hour apart, and it's been very different. So there's a lot of variability associated with the air samples. With a surface sample, it tends to be less variable. Q. Okay. Is that because a surface sample has to be	2 3 4 5	know, negligible, limited, moderate, or significant, or major? A. I think there's general agreement on the major part of it. In other words, if they're the way that this is typically interpreted and is primarily tease tape
2 3 4 5 6	I've taken samples in, let's say, a half hour apart, and it's been very different. So there's a lot of variability associated with the air samples. With a surface sample, it tends to be less variable. Q. Okay. Is that because a surface sample has to be disturbed more to to move?	2 3 4 5 6	know, negligible, limited, moderate, or significant, or major? A. I think there's general agreement on the major part of it. In other words, if they're the way that this is typically interpreted and is primarily tease tape samples slightly modified for the Air-O-Cell sample.
2 3 4 5 6 7	I've taken samples in, let's say, a half hour apart, and it's been very different. So there's a lot of variability associated with the air samples. With a surface sample, it tends to be less variable. Q. Okay. Is that because a surface sample has to be disturbed more to to move? A. I would say, yes, or it's settled there and it hasn't	2 3 4 5 6 7	know, negligible, limited, moderate, or significant, or major? A. I think there's general agreement on the major part of it. In other words, if they're the way that this is typically interpreted and is primarily tease tape samples slightly modified for the Air-O-Cell sample. But for a tease tape sample, if about 50 percent of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I've taken samples in, let's say, a half hour apart, and it's been very different. So there's a lot of variability associated with the air samples. With a surface sample, it tends to be less variable. Q. Okay. Is that because a surface sample has to be disturbed more to to move? A. I would say, yes, or it's settled there and it hasn't you know, I'm not I'm not relying on the aerodynamics	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	know, negligible, limited, moderate, or significant, or major? A. I think there's general agreement on the major part of it. In other words, if they're the way that this is typically interpreted and is primarily tease tape samples slightly modified for the Air-O-Cell sample. But for a tease tape sample, if about 50 percent of the particles you observe in a field are of one type, that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I've taken samples in, let's say, a half hour apart, and it's been very different. So there's a lot of variability associated with the air samples. With a surface sample, it tends to be less variable. Q. Okay. Is that because a surface sample has to be disturbed more to to move? A. I would say, yes, or it's settled there and it hasn't you know, I'm not I'm not relying on the aerodynamics of the particles to move around or mechanical force to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	know, negligible, limited, moderate, or significant, or major? A. I think there's general agreement on the major part of it. In other words, if they're the way that this is typically interpreted and is primarily tease tape samples slightly modified for the Air-O-Cell sample. But for a tease tape sample, if about 50 percent of the particles you observe in a field are of one type, that would be considered a major impact. And if you can't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I've taken samples in, let's say, a half hour apart, and it's been very different. So there's a lot of variability associated with the air samples. With a surface sample, it tends to be less variable. Q. Okay. Is that because a surface sample has to be disturbed more to to move? A. I would say, yes, or it's settled there and it hasn't you know, I'm not I'm not relying on the aerodynamics of the particles to move around or mechanical force to move it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	know, negligible, limited, moderate, or significant, or major? A. I think there's general agreement on the major part of it. In other words, if they're the way that this is typically interpreted and is primarily tease tape samples slightly modified for the Air-O-Cell sample. But for a tease tape sample, if about 50 percent of the particles you observe in a field are of one type, that would be considered a major impact. And if you can't then on the other end it's negligible if you can only
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I've taken samples in, let's say, a half hour apart, and it's been very different. So there's a lot of variability associated with the air samples. With a surface sample, it tends to be less variable. Q. Okay. Is that because a surface sample has to be disturbed more to to move? A. I would say, yes, or it's settled there and it hasn't you know, I'm not I'm not relying on the aerodynamics of the particles to move around or mechanical force to move it. Q. Okay. So there's a column on here in Exhibit 2 titled	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	know, negligible, limited, moderate, or significant, or major? A. I think there's general agreement on the major part of it. In other words, if they're the way that this is typically interpreted and is primarily tease tape samples slightly modified for the Air-O-Cell sample. But for a tease tape sample, if about 50 percent of the particles you observe in a field are of one type, that would be considered a major impact. And if you can't then on the other end it's negligible if you can only find less than 1 particle. That would be considered
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I've taken samples in, let's say, a half hour apart, and it's been very different. So there's a lot of variability associated with the air samples. With a surface sample, it tends to be less variable. Q. Okay. Is that because a surface sample has to be disturbed more to to move? A. I would say, yes, or it's settled there and it hasn't you know, I'm not I'm not relying on the aerodynamics of the particles to move around or mechanical force to move it. Q. Okay. So there's a column on here in Exhibit 2 titled Trace Density. Do you see that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	know, negligible, limited, moderate, or significant, or major? A. I think there's general agreement on the major part of it. In other words, if they're the way that this is typically interpreted and is primarily tease tape samples slightly modified for the Air-O-Cell sample. But for a tease tape sample, if about 50 percent of the particles you observe in a field are of one type, that would be considered a major impact. And if you can't then on the other end it's negligible if you can only find less than 1 particle. That would be considered negligible. In between there I think there's probably
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I've taken samples in, let's say, a half hour apart, and it's been very different. So there's a lot of variability associated with the air samples. With a surface sample, it tends to be less variable. Q. Okay. Is that because a surface sample has to be disturbed more to to move? A. I would say, yes, or it's settled there and it hasn't you know, I'm not I'm not relying on the aerodynamics of the particles to move around or mechanical force to move it. Q. Okay. So there's a column on here in Exhibit 2 titled Trace Density. Do you see that? A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	know, negligible, limited, moderate, or significant, or major? A. I think there's general agreement on the major part of it. In other words, if they're the way that this is typically interpreted and is primarily tease tape samples slightly modified for the Air-O-Cell sample. But for a tease tape sample, if about 50 percent of the particles you observe in a field are of one type, that would be considered a major impact. And if you can't then on the other end it's negligible if you can only find less than 1 particle. That would be considered negligible. In between there I think there's probably some room for interpretation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I've taken samples in, let's say, a half hour apart, and it's been very different. So there's a lot of variability associated with the air samples. With a surface sample, it tends to be less variable. Q. Okay. Is that because a surface sample has to be disturbed more to to move? A. I would say, yes, or it's settled there and it hasn't you know, I'm not I'm not relying on the aerodynamics of the particles to move around or mechanical force to move it. Q. Okay. So there's a column on here in Exhibit 2 titled Trace Density. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. Where do the terms moderate or light to moderate or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	know, negligible, limited, moderate, or significant, or major? A. I think there's general agreement on the major part of it. In other words, if they're the way that this is typically interpreted and is primarily tease tape samples slightly modified for the Air-O-Cell sample. But for a tease tape sample, if about 50 percent of the particles you observe in a field are of one type, that would be considered a major impact. And if you can't then on the other end it's negligible if you can only find less than 1 particle. That would be considered negligible. In between there I think there's probably some room for interpretation. Q. Okay. Is there any publication you can point me to that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I've taken samples in, let's say, a half hour apart, and it's been very different. So there's a lot of variability associated with the air samples. With a surface sample, it tends to be less variable. Q. Okay. Is that because a surface sample has to be disturbed more to to move? A. I would say, yes, or it's settled there and it hasn't you know, I'm not I'm not relying on the aerodynamics of the particles to move around or mechanical force to move it. Q. Okay. So there's a column on here in Exhibit 2 titled Trace Density. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. Where do the terms moderate or light to moderate or heavy come from? Are those from some independent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	know, negligible, limited, moderate, or significant, or major? A. I think there's general agreement on the major part of it. In other words, if they're the way that this is typically interpreted and is primarily tease tape samples slightly modified for the Air-O-Cell sample. But for a tease tape sample, if about 50 percent of the particles you observe in a field are of one type, that would be considered a major impact. And if you can't then on the other end it's negligible if you can only find less than 1 particle. That would be considered negligible. In between there I think there's probably some room for interpretation. Q. Okay. Is there any publication you can point me to that establishes any sort of standard for how these particle
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I've taken samples in, let's say, a half hour apart, and it's been very different. So there's a lot of variability associated with the air samples. With a surface sample, it tends to be less variable. Q. Okay. Is that because a surface sample has to be disturbed more to to move? A. I would say, yes, or it's settled there and it hasn't you know, I'm not I'm not relying on the aerodynamics of the particles to move around or mechanical force to move it. Q. Okay. So there's a column on here in Exhibit 2 titled Trace Density. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. Where do the terms moderate or light to moderate or heavy come from? Are those from some independent source, or are those your characterizations?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	know, negligible, limited, moderate, or significant, or major? A. I think there's general agreement on the major part of it. In other words, if they're the way that this is typically interpreted and is primarily tease tape samples slightly modified for the Air-O-Cell sample. But for a tease tape sample, if about 50 percent of the particles you observe in a field are of one type, that would be considered a major impact. And if you can't then on the other end it's negligible if you can only find less than 1 particle. That would be considered negligible. In between there I think there's probably some room for interpretation. Q. Okay. Is there any publication you can point me to that establishes any sort of standard for how these particle counts are characterized?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I've taken samples in, let's say, a half hour apart, and it's been very different. So there's a lot of variability associated with the air samples. With a surface sample, it tends to be less variable. Q. Okay. Is that because a surface sample has to be disturbed more to to move? A. I would say, yes, or it's settled there and it hasn't you know, I'm not I'm not relying on the aerodynamics of the particles to move around or mechanical force to move it. Q. Okay. So there's a column on here in Exhibit 2 titled Trace Density. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. Where do the terms moderate or light to moderate or heavy come from? Are those from some independent source, or are those your characterizations? A. They're my characterizations. I've seen them on other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	know, negligible, limited, moderate, or significant, or major? A. I think there's general agreement on the major part of it. In other words, if they're the way that this is typically interpreted and is primarily tease tape samples slightly modified for the Air-O-Cell sample. But for a tease tape sample, if about 50 percent of the particles you observe in a field are of one type, that would be considered a major impact. And if you can't then on the other end it's negligible if you can only find less than 1 particle. That would be considered negligible. In between there I think there's probably some room for interpretation. Q. Okay. Is there any publication you can point me to that establishes any sort of standard for how these particle counts are characterized? A. There may be some, but I can't off the top of my head.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I've taken samples in, let's say, a half hour apart, and it's been very different. So there's a lot of variability associated with the air samples. With a surface sample, it tends to be less variable. Q. Okay. Is that because a surface sample has to be disturbed more to to move? A. I would say, yes, or it's settled there and it hasn't you know, I'm not I'm not relying on the aerodynamics of the particles to move around or mechanical force to move it. Q. Okay. So there's a column on here in Exhibit 2 titled Trace Density. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. Where do the terms moderate or light to moderate or heavy come from? Are those from some independent source, or are those your characterizations? A. They're my characterizations. I've seen them on other reports. And essentially it helps. At least my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	know, negligible, limited, moderate, or significant, or major? A. I think there's general agreement on the major part of it. In other words, if they're the way that this is typically interpreted and is primarily tease tape samples slightly modified for the Air-O-Cell sample. But for a tease tape sample, if about 50 percent of the particles you observe in a field are of one type, that would be considered a major impact. And if you can't then on the other end it's negligible if you can only find less than 1 particle. That would be considered negligible. In between there I think there's probably some room for interpretation. Q. Okay. Is there any publication you can point me to that establishes any sort of standard for how these particle counts are characterized? A. There may be some, but I can't off the top of my head. Q. Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I've taken samples in, let's say, a half hour apart, and it's been very different. So there's a lot of variability associated with the air samples. With a surface sample, it tends to be less variable. Q. Okay. Is that because a surface sample has to be disturbed more to to move? A. I would say, yes, or it's settled there and it hasn't you know, I'm not I'm not relying on the aerodynamics of the particles to move around or mechanical force to move it. Q. Okay. So there's a column on here in Exhibit 2 titled Trace Density. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. Where do the terms moderate or light to moderate or heavy come from? Are those from some independent source, or are those your characterizations? A. They're my characterizations. I've seen them on other reports. And essentially it helps. At least my intention is to help the person that I'm sending the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	know, negligible, limited, moderate, or significant, or major? A. I think there's general agreement on the major part of it. In other words, if they're the way that this is typically interpreted and is primarily tease tape samples slightly modified for the Air-O-Cell sample. But for a tease tape sample, if about 50 percent of the particles you observe in a field are of one type, that would be considered a major impact. And if you can't then on the other end it's negligible if you can only find less than 1 particle. That would be considered negligible. In between there I think there's probably some room for interpretation. Q. Okay. Is there any publication you can point me to that establishes any sort of standard for how these particle counts are characterized? A. There may be some, but I can't off the top of my head. Q. Okay. A. No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I've taken samples in, let's say, a half hour apart, and it's been very different. So there's a lot of variability associated with the air samples. With a surface sample, it tends to be less variable. Q. Okay. Is that because a surface sample has to be disturbed more to to move? A. I would say, yes, or it's settled there and it hasn't you know, I'm not I'm not relying on the aerodynamics of the particles to move around or mechanical force to move it. Q. Okay. So there's a column on here in Exhibit 2 titled Trace Density. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. Where do the terms moderate or light to moderate or heavy come from? Are those from some independent source, or are those your characterizations? A. They're my characterizations. I've seen them on other reports. And essentially it helps. At least my intention is to help the person that I'm sending the sample, saying that that there's a and it's kind	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	know, negligible, limited, moderate, or significant, or major? A. I think there's general agreement on the major part of it. In other words, if they're the way that this is typically interpreted and is primarily tease tape samples slightly modified for the Air-O-Cell sample. But for a tease tape sample, if about 50 percent of the particles you observe in a field are of one type, that would be considered a major impact. And if you can't then on the other end it's negligible if you can only find less than 1 particle. That would be considered negligible. In between there I think there's probably some room for interpretation. Q. Okay. Is there any publication you can point me to that establishes any sort of standard for how these particle counts are characterized? A. There may be some, but I can't off the top of my head. Q. Okay. A. No. Q. So like if you look at the trace density of sample 1 in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I've taken samples in, let's say, a half hour apart, and it's been very different. So there's a lot of variability associated with the air samples. With a surface sample, it tends to be less variable. Q. Okay. Is that because a surface sample has to be disturbed more to to move? A. I would say, yes, or it's settled there and it hasn't you know, I'm not I'm not relying on the aerodynamics of the particles to move around or mechanical force to move it. Q. Okay. So there's a column on here in Exhibit 2 titled Trace Density. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. Where do the terms moderate or light to moderate or heavy come from? Are those from some independent source, or are those your characterizations? A. They're my characterizations. I've seen them on other reports. And essentially it helps. At least my intention is to help the person that I'm sending the sample, saying that that there's a and it's kind of a it's on a relative scale, but are are the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	know, negligible, limited, moderate, or significant, or major? A. I think there's general agreement on the major part of it. In other words, if they're the way that this is typically interpreted and is primarily tease tape samples slightly modified for the Air-O-Cell sample. But for a tease tape sample, if about 50 percent of the particles you observe in a field are of one type, that would be considered a major impact. And if you can't then on the other end it's negligible if you can only find less than 1 particle. That would be considered negligible. In between there I think there's probably some room for interpretation. Q. Okay. Is there any publication you can point me to that establishes any sort of standard for how these particle counts are characterized? A. There may be some, but I can't off the top of my head. Q. Okay. A. No. Q. So like if you look at the trace density of sample 1 in Room 407, it's described as moderate, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I've taken samples in, let's say, a half hour apart, and it's been very different. So there's a lot of variability associated with the air samples. With a surface sample, it tends to be less variable. Q. Okay. Is that because a surface sample has to be disturbed more to to move? A. I would say, yes, or it's settled there and it hasn't you know, I'm not I'm not relying on the aerodynamics of the particles to move around or mechanical force to move it. Q. Okay. So there's a column on here in Exhibit 2 titled Trace Density. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. Where do the terms moderate or light to moderate or heavy come from? Are those from some independent source, or are those your characterizations? A. They're my characterizations. I've seen them on other reports. And essentially it helps. At least my intention is to help the person that I'm sending the sample, saying that that there's a and it's kind of a it's on a relative scale, but are are the particles very dense or are they not too numerous. So,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	know, negligible, limited, moderate, or significant, or major? A. I think there's general agreement on the major part of it. In other words, if they're the way that this is typically interpreted and is primarily tease tape samples slightly modified for the Air-O-Cell sample. But for a tease tape sample, if about 50 percent of the particles you observe in a field are of one type, that would be considered a major impact. And if you can't then on the other end it's negligible if you can only find less than 1 particle. That would be considered negligible. In between there I think there's probably some room for interpretation. Q. Okay. Is there any publication you can point me to that establishes any sort of standard for how these particle counts are characterized? A. There may be some, but I can't off the top of my head. Q. Okay. A. No. Q. So like if you look at the trace density of sample 1 in Room 407, it's described as moderate, correct? A. Yes. Yep.

	Page 42		Page 44
1	Q. And if we go to char and soot-like particle	1	A. Yes.
2	interpretation, moderate is 2 to 10 particles per field,	2	Q. Sample 12 for char would be significant impact, correct,
3	correct?	3	for char?
4	A. No. The you're looking at the trace density? Or	4	A. Yes.
5	where are you?	5	Q. Okay. And it would be negligible for soot, correct?
6	Q. Yes.	6	A. Yes.
7	A. Okay. You're looking at sorry.	7	Q. Sample 13 would be moderate impact for char and
8	Q. That's okay	8	negligible for soot, correct?
9	A. The moderate, the trace density has nothing to do with	9	A. Yes.
10	that interpretation.	10	Q. Okay. Samples 14 and 16 would be negligible for both
11	Q. Okay. And why not?	11	char and soot, correct?
12	A. It just has to do with the total number of particles	12	A. Yes.
13	that are in there, but not the the number, if you're	13	Q. Sample 17 would be limited for char, correct?
14	going to interpret it, that would be the number after	14	A. Yes.
15	the char. So look at the number after the char. It's	15	Q. Negligible for soot, right?
16	less than 1. And then, if you look at the that would	16	A. Yes.
17	be particles per field. Does that make sense to you?	17	Q. Sample 19 would be limited for char, correct?
18	So it would be under the limited impact of smoke.	18	A. Yes.
19	Q. Okay. All right. So 1 would be	19	Q. And negligible for soot?
20	A. Less than 1 would be.	20	A. Yes.
21	Q limited?	21	Q. And sample 20 would be limited for char and negligible
22	A. Yeah.	22	for soot, correct?
23	Q. Correct?	23	A. Yes.
24	A. Yep.	24	Q. Okay.
25	Q. All right. 4 would be limited to moderate, correct?	25	A. And did you want to do 19, or not?
	Page 43		Page 45
1		1	Page 45 Q. Did I skip 19?
1 2	Page 43 A. Yeah. 4 would be like moderate, yeah. O. For char at least?	1 2	
	A. Yeah. 4 would be like moderate, yeah.		Q. Did I skip 19?
2	A. Yeah. 4 would be like moderate, yeah. Q. For char at least?	2	Q. Did I skip 19? A. Yes.
2	A. Yeah. 4 would be like moderate, yeah. Q. For char at least? A. Yeah.	2	Q. Did I skip 19? A. Yes. Q. Ah. 19 would be limited to moderate for char and
2 3 4	A. Yeah. 4 would be like moderate, yeah.Q. For char at least?A. Yeah.Q. Correct?	2 3 4	Q. Did I skip 19?A. Yes.Q. Ah. 19 would be limited to moderate for char and negligible for soot, correct?
2 3 4 5	A. Yeah. 4 would be like moderate, yeah. Q. For char at least? A. Yeah. Q. Correct? A. Yeah.	2 3 4 5	Q. Did I skip 19?A. Yes.Q. Ah. 19 would be limited to moderate for char and negligible for soot, correct?A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6	A. Yeah. 4 would be like moderate, yeah. Q. For char at least? A. Yeah. Q. Correct? A. Yeah. Q. Sample 6 would be limited, correct?	2 3 4 5 6	 Q. Did I skip 19? A. Yes. Q. Ah. 19 would be limited to moderate for char and negligible for soot, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Did you have any role in determining where
2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Yeah. 4 would be like moderate, yeah. Q. For char at least? A. Yeah. Q. Correct? A. Yeah. Q. Sample 6 would be limited, correct? A. Yep.	2 3 4 5 6	 Q. Did I skip 19? A. Yes. Q. Ah. 19 would be limited to moderate for char and negligible for soot, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Did you have any role in determining where these samples were taken from?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Yeah. 4 would be like moderate, yeah. Q. For char at least? A. Yeah. Q. Correct? A. Yeah. Q. Sample 6 would be limited, correct? A. Yep. Q. Okay. Sample 9 would be limited as well, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. Did I skip 19? A. Yes. Q. Ah. 19 would be limited to moderate for char and negligible for soot, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Did you have any role in determining where these samples were taken from? A. No, I did not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Yeah. 4 would be like moderate, yeah. Q. For char at least? A. Yeah. Q. Correct? A. Yeah. Q. Sample 6 would be limited, correct? A. Yep. Q. Okay. Sample 9 would be limited as well, correct? A. That's correct, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Did I skip 19? A. Yes. Q. Ah. 19 would be limited to moderate for char and negligible for soot, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Did you have any role in determining where these samples were taken from? A. No, I did not. Q. Is there a typical number of samples that you receive
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Yeah. 4 would be like moderate, yeah. Q. For char at least? A. Yeah. Q. Correct? A. Yeah. Q. Sample 6 would be limited, correct? A. Yep. Q. Okay. Sample 9 would be limited as well, correct? A. That's correct, yes. Q. As to char?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Did I skip 19? A. Yes. Q. Ah. 19 would be limited to moderate for char and negligible for soot, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Did you have any role in determining where these samples were taken from? A. No, I did not. Q. Is there a typical number of samples that you receive when you're doing work with FBS?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Yeah. 4 would be like moderate, yeah. Q. For char at least? A. Yeah. Q. Correct? A. Yeah. Q. Sample 6 would be limited, correct? A. Yep. Q. Okay. Sample 9 would be limited as well, correct? A. That's correct, yes. Q. As to char? A. Yep.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. Did I skip 19? A. Yes. Q. Ah. 19 would be limited to moderate for char and negligible for soot, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Did you have any role in determining where these samples were taken from? A. No, I did not. Q. Is there a typical number of samples that you receive when you're doing work with FBS? A. No. It's highly variable. It depends on how many
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Yeah. 4 would be like moderate, yeah. Q. For char at least? A. Yeah. Q. Correct? A. Yeah. Q. Sample 6 would be limited, correct? A. Yep. Q. Okay. Sample 9 would be limited as well, correct? A. That's correct, yes. Q. As to char? A. Yep. Q. And back to sample 1. Soot would be negligible,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. Did I skip 19? A. Yes. Q. Ah. 19 would be limited to moderate for char and negligible for soot, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Did you have any role in determining where these samples were taken from? A. No, I did not. Q. Is there a typical number of samples that you receive when you're doing work with FBS? A. No. It's highly variable. It depends on how many samples that they in their professional opinion
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Yeah. 4 would be like moderate, yeah. Q. For char at least? A. Yeah. Q. Correct? A. Yeah. Q. Sample 6 would be limited, correct? A. Yep. Q. Okay. Sample 9 would be limited as well, correct? A. That's correct, yes. Q. As to char? A. Yep. Q. And back to sample 1. Soot would be negligible, correct? Or limited?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. Did I skip 19? A. Yes. Q. Ah. 19 would be limited to moderate for char and negligible for soot, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Did you have any role in determining where these samples were taken from? A. No, I did not. Q. Is there a typical number of samples that you receive when you're doing work with FBS? A. No. It's highly variable. It depends on how many samples that they in their professional opinion determine they need to set up the scope. And I assume
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Yeah. 4 would be like moderate, yeah. Q. For char at least? A. Yeah. Q. Correct? A. Yeah. Q. Sample 6 would be limited, correct? A. Yep. Q. Okay. Sample 9 would be limited as well, correct? A. That's correct, yes. Q. As to char? A. Yep. Q. And back to sample 1. Soot would be negligible, correct? Or limited? A. Limited, yep. Yep.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. Did I skip 19? A. Yes. Q. Ah. 19 would be limited to moderate for char and negligible for soot, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Did you have any role in determining where these samples were taken from? A. No, I did not. Q. Is there a typical number of samples that you receive when you're doing work with FBS? A. No. It's highly variable. It depends on how many samples that they in their professional opinion determine they need to set up the scope. And I assume there's also a budget involved as far as how many
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Yeah. 4 would be like moderate, yeah. Q. For char at least? A. Yeah. Q. Correct? A. Yeah. Q. Sample 6 would be limited, correct? A. Yep. Q. Okay. Sample 9 would be limited as well, correct? A. That's correct, yes. Q. As to char? A. Yep. Q. And back to sample 1. Soot would be negligible, correct? Or limited? A. Limited, yep. Yep. Q. 4 would be negligible, correct, for soot?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. Did I skip 19? A. Yes. Q. Ah. 19 would be limited to moderate for char and negligible for soot, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Did you have any role in determining where these samples were taken from? A. No, I did not. Q. Is there a typical number of samples that you receive when you're doing work with FBS? A. No. It's highly variable. It depends on how many samples that they in their professional opinion determine they need to set up the scope. And I assume there's also a budget involved as far as how many samples that they're allowed to take.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Yeah. 4 would be like moderate, yeah. Q. For char at least? A. Yeah. Q. Correct? A. Yeah. Q. Sample 6 would be limited, correct? A. Yep. Q. Okay. Sample 9 would be limited as well, correct? A. That's correct, yes. Q. As to char? A. Yep. Q. And back to sample 1. Soot would be negligible, correct? Or limited? A. Limited, yep. Yep. Q. 4 would be negligible, correct, for soot? A. Yeah. That be would be negligible. Yep.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. Did I skip 19? A. Yes. Q. Ah. 19 would be limited to moderate for char and negligible for soot, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Did you have any role in determining where these samples were taken from? A. No, I did not. Q. Is there a typical number of samples that you receive when you're doing work with FBS? A. No. It's highly variable. It depends on how many samples that they in their professional opinion determine they need to set up the scope. And I assume there's also a budget involved as far as how many samples that they're allowed to take. Q. Are you aware of any established standard or protocol
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Yeah. 4 would be like moderate, yeah. Q. For char at least? A. Yeah. Q. Correct? A. Yeah. Q. Sample 6 would be limited, correct? A. Yep. Q. Okay. Sample 9 would be limited as well, correct? A. That's correct, yes. Q. As to char? A. Yep. Q. And back to sample 1. Soot would be negligible, correct? Or limited? A. Limited, yep. Yep. Q. 4 would be negligible, correct, for soot? A. Yeah. That be would be negligible. Yep. Q. All right. 6 would be limited for soot or negligible	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. Did I skip 19? A. Yes. Q. Ah. 19 would be limited to moderate for char and negligible for soot, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Did you have any role in determining where these samples were taken from? A. No, I did not. Q. Is there a typical number of samples that you receive when you're doing work with FBS? A. No. It's highly variable. It depends on how many samples that they in their professional opinion determine they need to set up the scope. And I assume there's also a budget involved as far as how many samples that they're allowed to take. Q. Are you aware of any established standard or protocol governing the number of samples that must be taken per
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Yeah. 4 would be like moderate, yeah. Q. For char at least? A. Yeah. Q. Correct? A. Yeah. Q. Sample 6 would be limited, correct? A. Yep. Q. Okay. Sample 9 would be limited as well, correct? A. That's correct, yes. Q. As to char? A. Yep. Q. And back to sample 1. Soot would be negligible, correct? Or limited? A. Limited, yep. Yep. Q. 4 would be negligible, correct, for soot? A. Yeah. That be would be negligible. Yep. Q. All right. 6 would be limited for soot or negligible to limited for soot, right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. Did I skip 19? A. Yes. Q. Ah. 19 would be limited to moderate for char and negligible for soot, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Did you have any role in determining where these samples were taken from? A. No, I did not. Q. Is there a typical number of samples that you receive when you're doing work with FBS? A. No. It's highly variable. It depends on how many samples that they in their professional opinion determine they need to set up the scope. And I assume there's also a budget involved as far as how many samples that they're allowed to take. Q. Are you aware of any established standard or protocol governing the number of samples that must be taken per square foot or cubic foot of a building?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Yeah. 4 would be like moderate, yeah. Q. For char at least? A. Yeah. Q. Correct? A. Yeah. Q. Sample 6 would be limited, correct? A. Yep. Q. Okay. Sample 9 would be limited as well, correct? A. That's correct, yes. Q. As to char? A. Yep. Q. And back to sample 1. Soot would be negligible, correct? Or limited? A. Limited, yep. Yep. Q. 4 would be negligible, correct, for soot? A. Yeah. That be would be negligible. Yep. Q. All right. 6 would be limited for soot or negligible to limited for soot, yeah.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. Did I skip 19? A. Yes. Q. Ah. 19 would be limited to moderate for char and negligible for soot, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Did you have any role in determining where these samples were taken from? A. No, I did not. Q. Is there a typical number of samples that you receive when you're doing work with FBS? A. No. It's highly variable. It depends on how many samples that they in their professional opinion determine they need to set up the scope. And I assume there's also a budget involved as far as how many samples that they're allowed to take. Q. Are you aware of any established standard or protocol governing the number of samples that must be taken per square foot or cubic foot of a building? A. I am not personally aware of that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Yeah. 4 would be like moderate, yeah. Q. For char at least? A. Yeah. Q. Correct? A. Yeah. Q. Sample 6 would be limited, correct? A. Yep. Q. Okay. Sample 9 would be limited as well, correct? A. That's correct, yes. Q. As to char? A. Yep. Q. And back to sample 1. Soot would be negligible, correct? Or limited? A. Limited, yep. Yep. Q. 4 would be negligible, correct, for soot? A. Yeah. That be would be negligible. Yep. Q. All right. 6 would be limited for soot or negligible to limited for soot, right? A. Negligible for soot, yeah. Q. Okay. So 9 would be negligible for soot, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. Did I skip 19? A. Yes. Q. Ah. 19 would be limited to moderate for char and negligible for soot, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Did you have any role in determining where these samples were taken from? A. No, I did not. Q. Is there a typical number of samples that you receive when you're doing work with FBS? A. No. It's highly variable. It depends on how many samples that they in their professional opinion determine they need to set up the scope. And I assume there's also a budget involved as far as how many samples that they're allowed to take. Q. Are you aware of any established standard or protocol governing the number of samples that must be taken per square foot or cubic foot of a building? A. I am not personally aware of that. Q. Okay. So, if we move down here to the tape samples on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Yeah. 4 would be like moderate, yeah. Q. For char at least? A. Yeah. Q. Correct? A. Yeah. Q. Sample 6 would be limited, correct? A. Yep. Q. Okay. Sample 9 would be limited as well, correct? A. That's correct, yes. Q. As to char? A. Yep. Q. And back to sample 1. Soot would be negligible, correct? Or limited? A. Limited, yep. Yep. Q. 4 would be negligible, correct, for soot? A. Yeah. That be would be negligible. Yep. Q. All right. 6 would be limited for soot or negligible to limited for soot, right? A. Negligible for soot, yeah. Q. Okay. So 9 would be negligible for soot, correct? A. That's correct. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. Did I skip 19? A. Yes. Q. Ah. 19 would be limited to moderate for char and negligible for soot, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Did you have any role in determining where these samples were taken from? A. No, I did not. Q. Is there a typical number of samples that you receive when you're doing work with FBS? A. No. It's highly variable. It depends on how many samples that they in their professional opinion determine they need to set up the scope. And I assume there's also a budget involved as far as how many samples that they're allowed to take. Q. Are you aware of any established standard or protocol governing the number of samples that must be taken per square foot or cubic foot of a building? A. I am not personally aware of that. Q. Okay. So, if we move down here to the tape samples on Exhibit 2, you see there's one Room 407 wood burning
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Yeah. 4 would be like moderate, yeah. Q. For char at least? A. Yeah. Q. Correct? A. Yeah. Q. Sample 6 would be limited, correct? A. Yep. Q. Okay. Sample 9 would be limited as well, correct? A. That's correct, yes. Q. As to char? A. Yep. Q. And back to sample 1. Soot would be negligible, correct? Or limited? A. Limited, yep. Yep. Q. 4 would be negligible, correct, for soot? A. Yeah. That be would be negligible. Yep. Q. All right. 6 would be limited for soot or negligible to limited for soot, right? A. Negligible for soot, yeah. Q. Okay. So 9 would be negligible for soot, correct? A. That's correct. Yes. Q. Sample 9 would be limited impact for char, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. Did I skip 19? A. Yes. Q. Ah. 19 would be limited to moderate for char and negligible for soot, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Did you have any role in determining where these samples were taken from? A. No, I did not. Q. Is there a typical number of samples that you receive when you're doing work with FBS? A. No. It's highly variable. It depends on how many samples that they in their professional opinion determine they need to set up the scope. And I assume there's also a budget involved as far as how many samples that they're allowed to take. Q. Are you aware of any established standard or protocol governing the number of samples that must be taken per square foot or cubic foot of a building? A. I am not personally aware of that. Q. Okay. So, if we move down here to the tape samples on Exhibit 2, you see there's one Room 407 wood burning fireplace tape lift. Do you see that?

	Page 46		Page 48
1	A. Yes.	1	A. Yes.
2	Q. And that's 50 plus particles of char, right?	2	Q. All right. And do you know what types of particles
3	A. Yes.	3	those might be?
4	Q. But no soot, correct?	4	A. I don't recall. I'll see if it's okay for you, I'll
5	A. Yes.	5	see if I have the photo from that.
6	Q. Okay. Is there a typical proportion of char to soot	6	Q. Sure.
7	that you see in wildfire residue?	7	A. It might help. I do not have the photo from that; so I
8	A. I would not be qualified to answer that question.	8	would not know.
9	Q. Okay. Would you be qualified to well, let me ask a	9	Q. In analyzing samples like this under a microscope, are
10	similar question. Is there a typical proportion of char	10	you typically seeing more particles than just the char
11	to soot that you would expect to see just from use of a	11	and the soot?
12	wood burning fireplace?	12	A. Yes.
13	A. I'm not I don't know.	13	Q. For example, there could be there could be like
14	Q. Okay. Do you consider yourself qualified to even answer	14	residual dead skin, correct?
15	the question?	15	A. Yes.
16	A. With respect to knowledge about the proportion of char	16	Q. Could be dead insects in there, correct?
17	and soot emanating from a fireplace, I'm not qualified	17	A. Yes.
18	to answer that question.	18	Q. All right: Could be burnt clays, right?
19	Q. Okay. Do you expect to see more char or soot in a	19	A. There could be; although, I I don't do analysis for
20	wildfire?	20	that. So
21	MR. SCOTT: Object to the form.	21	Q. Okay. Suffice to say, there's lots of other types of
22	Q. (MR. DEVILLING) That was a poor question.	22	residue in in a tape sample that you're looking at,
23	Do you know if if you would expect to see a	23	correct?
24	higher level of char or a higher level of soot in a	24	A. Yes.
25	wildfire?	25	Q. And what you're doing is just trying to identify the
ļ			
	Page 47		
	rage 47		Page 49
1	A. I'm not qualified to answer that.	1	Page 49 char and the soot within all those other types for your
1 2		1 2	
	A. I'm not qualified to answer that.	1	char and the soot within all those other types for your
2	A. I'm not qualified to answer that. MR. SCOTT: Object to the form.	2	char and the soot within all those other types for your analysis?
2 3	A. I'm not qualified to answer that. MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. A. Sorry.	2	char and the soot within all those other types for your analysis? A. The char-like and soot-like particles.
2 3 4	A. I'm not qualified to answer that. MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. A. Sorry. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) Let's look at Exhibit 3.	2 3 4	char and the soot within all those other types for your analysis? A. The char-like and soot-like particles. Q. Okay.
2 3 4 5	A. I'm not qualified to answer that. MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. A. Sorry. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) Let's look at Exhibit 3. A. Okay. That is the Rocky Waters Motors Inn?	2 3 4 5	char and the soot within all those other types for your analysis? A. The char-like and soot-like particles. Q. Okay. A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6	A. I'm not qualified to answer that. MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. A. Sorry. Q. (MR, DEVILLING) Let's look at Exhibit 3. A. Okay. That is the Rocky Waters Motors Inn? Q. Correct.	2 3 4 5 6	char and the soot within all those other types for your analysis? A. The char-like and soot-like particles. Q. Okay. A. Yes. Q. Okay. If we look at this report here, Exhibit Number 3,
2 3 4 5 6 7	A. I'm not qualified to answer that. MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. A. Sorry. Q. (MR, DEVILLING) Let's look at Exhibit 3. A. Okay. That is the Rocky Waters Motors Inn? Q. Correct. A. Okay.	2 3 4 5 6	char and the soot within all those other types for your analysis? A. The char-like and soot-like particles. Q. Okay. A. Yes. Q. Okay. If we look at this report here, Exhibit Number 3, let's go to the let's take sample number 2 and sample number 4 as an example. So, when you're looking at sample number 2 and describing the trace density as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. I'm not qualified to answer that. MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. A. Sorry. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) Let's look at Exhibit 3. A. Okay. That is the Rocky Waters Motors Inn? Q. Correct. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of your report	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	char and the soot within all those other types for your analysis? A. The char-like and soot-like particles. Q. Okay. A. Yes. Q. Okay. If we look at this report here, Exhibit Number 3, let's go to the let's take sample number 2 and sample number 4 as an example. So, when you're looking at sample number 2 and describing the trace density as light, can you give me an estimate of the number of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. I'm not qualified to answer that. MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. A. Sorry. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) Let's look at Exhibit 3. A. Okay. That is the Rocky Waters Motors Inn? Q. Correct. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of your report with respect to your analysis for the Rocky Waters Motor	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	char and the soot within all those other types for your analysis? A. The char-like and soot-like particles. Q. Okay. A. Yes. Q. Okay. If we look at this report here, Exhibit Number 3, let's go to the let's take sample number 2 and sample number 4 as an example. So, when you're looking at sample number 2 and describing the trace density as light, can you give me an estimate of the number of particles per field that you're talking about there?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. I'm not qualified to answer that. MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. A. Sorry. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) Let's look at Exhibit 3. A. Okay. That is the Rocky Waters Motors Inn? Q. Correct. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of your report with respect to your analysis for the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	char and the soot within all those other types for your analysis? A. The char-like and soot-like particles. Q. Okay. A. Yes. Q. Okay. If we look at this report here, Exhibit Number 3, let's go to the let's take sample number 2 and sample number 4 as an example. So, when you're looking at sample number 2 and describing the trace density as light, can you give me an estimate of the number of particles per field that you're talking about there? A. It would be a range probably less than 5 particles per
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. I'm not qualified to answer that. MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. A. Sorry. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) Let's look at Exhibit 3. A. Okay. That is the Rocky Waters Motors Inn? Q. Correct. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of your report with respect to your analysis for the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, correct? A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	char and the soot within all those other types for your analysis? A. The char-like and soot-like particles. Q. Okay. A. Yes. Q. Okay. If we look at this report here, Exhibit Number 3, let's go to the let's take sample number 2 and sample number 4 as an example. So, when you're looking at sample number 2 and describing the trace density as light, can you give me an estimate of the number of particles per field that you're talking about there? A. It would be a range probably less than 5 particles per field. It's very easy to see through. There isn't a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. I'm not qualified to answer that. MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. A. Sorry. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) Let's look at Exhibit 3. A. Okay. That is the Rocky Waters Motors Inn? Q. Correct. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of your report with respect to your analysis for the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And it's got the same char and soot-like particle interpretation table, correct? A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	char and the soot within all those other types for your analysis? A. The char-like and soot-like particles. Q. Okay. A. Yes. Q. Okay. If we look at this report here, Exhibit Number 3, let's go to the let's take sample number 2 and sample number 4 as an example. So, when you're looking at sample number 2 and describing the trace density as light, can you give me an estimate of the number of particles per field that you're talking about there? A. It would be a range probably less than 5 particles per field. It's very easy to see through. There isn't a lot of obstruction.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. I'm not qualified to answer that. MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. A. Sorry. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) Let's look at Exhibit 3. A. Okay. That is the Rocky Waters Motors Inn? Q. Correct. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of your report with respect to your analysis for the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And it's got the same char and soot-like particle interpretation table, correct? A. Yes. Q. Okay. So is trace density, in that column, is that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	char and the soot within all those other types for your analysis? A. The char-like and soot-like particles. Q. Okay. A. Yes. Q. Okay. If we look at this report here, Exhibit Number 3, let's go to the let's take sample number 2 and sample number 4 as an example. So, when you're looking at sample number 2 and describing the trace density as light, can you give me an estimate of the number of particles per field that you're talking about there? A. It would be a range probably less than 5 particles per field. It's very easy to see through. There isn't a lot of obstruction. Q. Okay. And then we've got number 4. Trace density is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. I'm not qualified to answer that. MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. A. Sorry. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) Let's look at Exhibit 3. A. Okay. That is the Rocky Waters Motors Inn? Q. Correct. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of your report with respect to your analysis for the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And it's got the same char and soot-like particle interpretation table, correct? A. Yes. Q. Okay. So is trace density, in that column, is that basically like your impression just looking at the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	char and the soot within all those other types for your analysis? A. The char-like and soot-like particles. Q. Okay. A. Yes. Q. Okay. If we look at this report here, Exhibit Number 3, let's go to the let's take sample number 2 and sample number 4 as an example. So, when you're looking at sample number 2 and describing the trace density as light, can you give me an estimate of the number of particles per field that you're talking about there? A. It would be a range probably less than 5 particles per field. It's very easy to see through. There isn't a lot of obstruction. Q. Okay. And then we've got number 4. Trace density is described as very heavy. Can you tell me about how many
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. I'm not qualified to answer that. MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. A. Sorry. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) Let's look at Exhibit 3. A. Okay. That is the Rocky Waters Motors Inn? Q. Correct. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of your report with respect to your analysis for the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And it's got the same char and soot-like particle interpretation table, correct? A. Yes. Q. Okay. So is trace density, in that column, is that basically like your impression just looking at the density through the microscope?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	char and the soot within all those other types for your analysis? A. The char-like and soot-like particles. Q. Okay. A. Yes. Q. Okay. If we look at this report here, Exhibit Number 3, let's go to the let's take sample number 2 and sample number 4 as an example. So, when you're looking at sample number 2 and describing the trace density as light, can you give me an estimate of the number of particles per field that you're talking about there? A. It would be a range probably less than 5 particles per field. It's very easy to see through. There isn't a lot of obstruction. Q. Okay. And then we've got number 4. Trace density is described as very heavy. Can you tell me about how many particles per field very heavy would be?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. I'm not qualified to answer that. MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. A. Sorry. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) Let's look at Exhibit 3. A. Okay. That is the Rocky Waters Motors Inn? Q. Correct. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of your report with respect to your analysis for the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And it's got the same char and soot-like particle interpretation table, correct? A. Yes. Q. Okay. So is trace density, in that column, is that basically like your impression just looking at the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	char and the soot within all those other types for your analysis? A. The char-like and soot-like particles. Q. Okay. A. Yes. Q. Okay. If we look at this report here, Exhibit Number 3, let's go to the let's take sample number 2 and sample number 4 as an example. So, when you're looking at sample number 2 and describing the trace density as light, can you give me an estimate of the number of particles per field that you're talking about there? A. It would be a range probably less than 5 particles per field. It's very easy to see through. There isn't a lot of obstruction. Q. Okay. And then we've got number 4. Trace density is described as very heavy. Can you tell me about how many
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. I'm not qualified to answer that. MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. A. Sorry. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) Let's look at Exhibit 3. A. Okay. That is the Rocky Waters Motors Inn? Q. Correct. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of your report with respect to your analysis for the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And it's got the same char and soot-like particle interpretation table, correct? A. Yes. Q. Okay. So is trace density, in that column, is that basically like your impression just looking at the density through the microscope?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	char and the soot within all those other types for your analysis? A. The char-like and soot-like particles. Q. Okay. A. Yes. Q. Okay. If we look at this report here, Exhibit Number 3, let's go to the let's take sample number 2 and sample number 4 as an example. So, when you're looking at sample number 2 and describing the trace density as light, can you give me an estimate of the number of particles per field that you're talking about there? A. It would be a range probably less than 5 particles per field. It's very easy to see through. There isn't a lot of obstruction. Q. Okay. And then we've got number 4. Trace density is described as very heavy. Can you tell me about how many particles per field very heavy would be? A. There would be thousands of particles per field. Q. Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. I'm not qualified to answer that. MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. A. Sorry. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) Let's look at Exhibit 3. A. Okay. That is the Rocky Waters Motors Inn? Q. Correct. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of your report with respect to your analysis for the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And it's got the same char and soot-like particle interpretation table, correct? A. Yes. Q. Okay. So is trace density, in that column, is that basically like your impression just looking at the density through the microscope? A. Yes. It's looking at the total number of particles, irrespective to type. Q. Ah, okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	char and the soot within all those other types for your analysis? A. The char-like and soot-like particles. Q. Okay. A. Yes. Q. Okay. If we look at this report here, Exhibit Number 3, let's go to the let's take sample number 2 and sample number 4 as an example. So, when you're looking at sample number 2 and describing the trace density as light, can you give me an estimate of the number of particles per field that you're talking about there? A. It would be a range probably less than 5 particles per field. It's very easy to see through. There isn't a lot of obstruction. Q. Okay. And then we've got number 4. Trace density is described as very heavy. Can you tell me about how many particles per field very heavy would be? A. There would be thousands of particles per field. Q. Okay. A. It would be essentially like looking like this.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. I'm not qualified to answer that. MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. A. Sorry. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) Let's look at Exhibit 3. A. Okay. That is the Rocky Waters Motors Inn? Q. Correct. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of your report with respect to your analysis for the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And it's got the same char and soot-like particle interpretation table, correct? A. Yes. Q. Okay. So is trace density, in that column, is that basically like your impression just looking at the density through the microscope? A. Yes. It's looking at the total number of particles, irrespective to type. Q. Ah, okay. A. Does that help?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	char and the soot within all those other types for your analysis? A. The char-like and soot-like particles. Q. Okay. A. Yes. Q. Okay. If we look at this report here, Exhibit Number 3, let's go to the let's take sample number 2 and sample number 4 as an example. So, when you're looking at sample number 2 and describing the trace density as light, can you give me an estimate of the number of particles per field that you're talking about there? A. It would be a range probably less than 5 particles per field. It's very easy to see through. There isn't a lot of obstruction. Q. Okay. And then we've got number 4. Trace density is described as very heavy. Can you tell me about how many particles per field very heavy would be? A. There would be thousands of particles per field. Q. Okay. A. It would be essentially like looking like this. Q. Okay. So, when we see under number 4, 8 to 10 char
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. I'm not qualified to answer that. MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. A. Sorry. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) Let's look at Exhibit 3. A. Okay. That is the Rocky Waters Motors Inn? Q. Correct. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of your report with respect to your analysis for the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And it's got the same char and soot-like particle interpretation table, correct? A. Yes. Q. Okay. So is trace density, in that column, is that basically like your impression just looking at the density through the microscope? A. Yes. It's looking at the total number of particles, irrespective to type. Q. Ah, okay. A. Does that help? Q. Yes. Yes. Okay. So, for example, sample number 4,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	char and the soot within all those other types for your analysis? A. The char-like and soot-like particles. Q. Okay. A. Yes. Q. Okay. If we look at this report here, Exhibit Number 3, let's go to the let's take sample number 2 and sample number 4 as an example. So, when you're looking at sample number 2 and describing the trace density as light, can you give me an estimate of the number of particles per field that you're talking about there? A. It would be a range probably less than 5 particles per field. It's very easy to see through. There isn't a lot of obstruction. Q. Okay. And then we've got number 4. Trace density is described as very heavy. Can you tell me about how many particles per field very heavy would be? A. There would be thousands of particles per field. Q. Okay. A. It would be essentially like looking like this. Q. Okay. So, when we see under number 4, 8 to 10 char particles per field, that says nothing about what the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. I'm not qualified to answer that. MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. A. Sorry. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) Let's look at Exhibit 3. A. Okay. That is the Rocky Waters Motors Inn? Q. Correct. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of your report with respect to your analysis for the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And it's got the same char and soot-like particle interpretation table, correct? A. Yes. Q. Okay. So is trace density, in that column, is that basically like your impression just looking at the density through the microscope? A. Yes. It's looking at the total number of particles, irrespective to type. Q. Ah, okay. A. Does that help? Q. Yes. Yes. Okay. So, for example, sample number 4, Room 105, bathroom, dropped ceiling, it says trace	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	char and the soot within all those other types for your analysis? A. The char-like and soot-like particles. Q. Okay. A. Yes. Q. Okay. If we look at this report here, Exhibit Number 3, let's go to the let's take sample number 2 and sample number 4 as an example. So, when you're looking at sample number 2 and describing the trace density as light, can you give me an estimate of the number of particles per field that you're talking about there? A. It would be a range probably less than 5 particles per field. It's very easy to see through. There isn't a lot of obstruction. Q. Okay. And then we've got number 4. Trace density is described as very heavy. Can you tell me about how many particles per field very heavy would be? A. There would be thousands of particles per field. Q. Okay. A. It would be essentially like looking like this. Q. Okay. So, when we see under number 4, 8 to 10 char particles per field, that says nothing about what the percentage of char is with respect to all of the other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. I'm not qualified to answer that. MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. A. Sorry. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) Let's look at Exhibit 3. A. Okay. That is the Rocky Waters Motors Inn? Q. Correct. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of your report with respect to your analysis for the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And it's got the same char and soot-like particle interpretation table, correct? A. Yes. Q. Okay. So is trace density, in that column, is that basically like your impression just looking at the density through the microscope? A. Yes. It's looking at the total number of particles, irrespective to type. Q. Ah, okay. A. Does that help? Q. Yes. Yes. Okay. So, for example, sample number 4,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	char and the soot within all those other types for your analysis? A. The char-like and soot-like particles. Q. Okay. A. Yes. Q. Okay. If we look at this report here, Exhibit Number 3, let's go to the let's take sample number 2 and sample number 4 as an example. So, when you're looking at sample number 2 and describing the trace density as light, can you give me an estimate of the number of particles per field that you're talking about there? A. It would be a range probably less than 5 particles per field. It's very easy to see through. There isn't a lot of obstruction. Q. Okay. And then we've got number 4. Trace density is described as very heavy. Can you tell me about how many particles per field very heavy would be? A. There would be thousands of particles per field. Q. Okay. A. It would be essentially like looking like this. Q. Okay. So, when we see under number 4, 8 to 10 char particles per field, that says nothing about what the

	Page 50		Page 52
1	Q. Okay	1	there be for presence of 50 plus soot particles in one
2	A. The char particles would typically be the darker	2	wood burning fireplace and no soot particles in another
3	particles, and there would be lighter colored particles	3	wood burning fireplace?
4	that I wouldn't know. And in that case the soot	4	A. Well, there may be
5	particles would be extremely hard to see because they're	5	MR_SCOTT: Object to the form I think
6	smaller, and they would be covered up by everything	6	he's already testified that he's not qualified, but you
7	else.	7	can answer.
8	Q. Understood. Okay. If you go to the tape samples, it	8	THE WITNESS: Yeah.
9	looks like sample 1 and sample 12 are both fireplace	9	Q (MR DEVILLING) If you know
10	samples, correct?	10	A. It would be generally a different combustion
11	A. Yes.	11	temperature, or it may be a different sampling location.
12	Q. And number 1 you found char particles 20 to 30, and soot	12	Q. Okay
13	50 plus, correct?	13	A. So there may be some char over here. May be some soot
14	A. Yes.	14	over here, and you're sampling with a tease tape, trying
15	Q. And then sample 12, you have char participate 10 to 20	15	to represent an area. So
16	and soot 50 plus, correct?	16	Q_{\ast} Okay $_{\ast}$ And, again, I'm just asking you what some
17	A. Yes.	17	possibilities might be.
18	Q. If you compare that to the fireplace sample that was	18	A. Yeah.
19	taken from the Days Inn, that would be sample number 2.	19	Q. And not.
20	Do you have that?	20	A. Yeah.
21	A. Yes. I have both of them. That would be sample number	21	$Q_{\scriptscriptstyle{\rm B}}$ I understand that's not not something that you know
22	2 from the let me make sure I've got the exhibit	22	for certain, correct?
23	right.	23	A. That is correct. Yes.
24	Q. Exhibit 2.	24	Q. Okay. If you go back to the char and soot-like particle
25	A. Yes. That's correct, yeah.	25	interpretation on here, you see it's listed at 400x,
	Page 51		Page 53
1	Q. So, comparing sample 2 from the Days Inn from sample 1	1	correct?
2	from Rocky Waters Motor Inn, there are a few differences		COTT CCC.
	Holl Rocky Waters Flotor Illi, there are a few afferences	2	A. The that's yeah. That's the magnification.
3	there, correct?	2	
3 4			A. The that's yeah. That's the magnification.
	there, correct?	3	A. The that's yeah. That's the magnification. Q. Okay. Now, if we go to your comments after the tables,
4	there, correct? A. Yes.	3 4	A. The that's yeah. That's the magnification. Q. Okay. Now, if we go to your comments after the tables, right now I'm looking at the Rocky Waters Motor Inn
4 5	there, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. For one thing, there's soot at Rocky Waters	3 4 5	A. The that's yeah. That's the magnification. Q. Okay. Now, if we go to your comments after the tables, right now I'm looking at the Rocky Waters Motor Inn Report. That's Exhibit 3.
4 5 6	there, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. For one thing, there's soot at Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot over at the Days Inn, correct?	3 4 5 6	A. The that's yeah. That's the magnification. Q. Okay. Now, if we go to your comments after the tables, right now I'm looking at the Rocky Waters Motor Inn Report. That's Exhibit 3. A. Yes. And are a question. You're referring to the
4 5 6 7	there, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. For one thing, there's soot at Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot over at the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes.	3 4 5 6 7	A. The that's yeah. That's the magnification. Q. Okay. Now, if we go to your comments after the tables, right now I'm looking at the Rocky Waters Motor Inn Report. That's Exhibit 3. A. Yes. And are a question. You're referring to the discussion section?
4 5 6 7 8	there, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. For one thing, there's soot at Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot over at the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you explain	3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. The that's yeah. That's the magnification. Q. Okay. Now, if we go to your comments after the tables, right now I'm looking at the Rocky Waters Motor Inn Report. That's Exhibit 3. A. Yes. And are a question. You're referring to the discussion section? Q. Well, I want to talk about methods first.
4 5 6 7 8	there, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. For one thing, there's soot at Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot over at the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you explain MR. SCOTT: Object to the form.	3 4 5 6 7 8	A. The that's yeah. That's the magnification. Q. Okay. Now, if we go to your comments after the tables, right now I'm looking at the Rocky Waters Motor Inn Report. That's Exhibit 3. A. Yes. And are a question. You're referring to the discussion section? Q. Well, I want to talk about methods first. A. Okay. Yes.
4 5 6 7 8 9	there, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. For one thing, there's soot at Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot over at the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you explain MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. MR. DEVILLING: Yeah. Let me restate that	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. The that's yeah. That's the magnification. Q. Okay. Now, if we go to your comments after the tables, right now I'm looking at the Rocky Waters Motor Inn Report. That's Exhibit 3. A. Yes. And are a question. You're referring to the discussion section? Q. Well, I want to talk about methods first. A. Okay. Yes. Q. It says the Air-O cassette traces were identified under
4 5 6 7 8 9 10	there, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. For one thing, there's soot at Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot over at the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you explain MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. MR. DEVILLING: Yeah. Let me restate that question.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. The that's yeah. That's the magnification. Q. Okay. Now, if we go to your comments after the tables, right now I'm looking at the Rocky Waters Motor Inn Report. That's Exhibit 3. A. Yes. And are a question. You're referring to the discussion section? Q. Well, I want to talk about methods first. A. Okay. Yes. Q. It says the Air-O cassette traces were identified under light microscopy viewed at 100x, 200x and 400x, correct? A. Yes. Q. I thought you said your microscope only went to 60x.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	there, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. For one thing, there's soot at Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot over at the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you explain MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. MR. DEVILLING: Yeah. Let me restate that question. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) so, for one thing, there's soot shown	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. The that's yeah. That's the magnification. Q. Okay. Now, if we go to your comments after the tables, right now I'm looking at the Rocky Waters Motor Inn Report. That's Exhibit 3. A. Yes. And are a question. You're referring to the discussion section? Q. Well, I want to talk about methods first. A. Okay. Yes. Q. It says the Air-O cassette traces were identified under light microscopy viewed at 100x, 200x and 400x, correct? A. Yes. Q. I thought you said your microscope only went to 60x. A. No. 600. It's the 60x is the magnification.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. For one thing, there's soot at Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot over at the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you explain MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. MR. DEVILLING: Yeah. Let me restate that question. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) so, for one thing, there's soot shown in sample number 1 from the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. The that's yeah. That's the magnification. Q. Okay. Now, if we go to your comments after the tables, right now I'm looking at the Rocky Waters Motor Inn Report. That's Exhibit 3. A. Yes. And are a question. You're referring to the discussion section? Q. Well, I want to talk about methods first. A. Okay. Yes. Q. It says the Air-O cassette traces were identified under light microscopy viewed at 100x, 200x and 400x, correct? A. Yes. Q. I thought you said your microscope only went to 60x. A. No. 600. It's the 60x is the magnification. There's a 10. Good question. There's a 10x, 10x up
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. For one thing, there's soot at Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot over at the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you explain MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. MR. DEVILLING: Yeah. Let me restate that question. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) so, for one thing, there's soot shown in sample number 1 from the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot shown in sample number 2 from the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. The that's yeah. That's the magnification. Q. Okay. Now, if we go to your comments after the tables, right now I'm looking at the Rocky Waters Motor Inn Report. That's Exhibit 3. A. Yes. And are a question. You're referring to the discussion section? Q. Well, I want to talk about methods first. A. Okay. Yes. Q. It says the Air-O cassette traces were identified under light microscopy viewed at 100x, 200x and 400x, correct? A. Yes. Q. I thought you said your microscope only went to 60x. A. No. 600. It's the 60x is the magnification. There's a 10. Good question. There's a 10x, 10x up here and 60 down here.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	there, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. For one thing, there's soot at Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot over at the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you explain MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. MR. DEVILLING: Yeah. Let me restate that question. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) so, for one thing, there's soot shown in sample number 1 from the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot shown in sample number 2 from the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Can you explain why there is 50 plus level	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. The that's yeah. That's the magnification. Q. Okay. Now, if we go to your comments after the tables, right now I'm looking at the Rocky Waters Motor Inn Report. That's Exhibit 3. A. Yes. And are a question. You're referring to the discussion section? Q. Well, I want to talk about methods first. A. Okay. Yes. Q. It says the Air-O cassette traces were identified under light microscopy viewed at 100x, 200x and 400x, correct? A. Yes. Q. I thought you said your microscope only went to 60x. A. No. 600. It's the 60x is the magnification. There's a 10. Good question. There's a 10x, 10x up here and 60 down here. Q. Ah.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	there, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. For one thing, there's soot at Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot over at the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you explain MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. MR. DEVILLING: Yeah. Let me restate that question. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) so, for one thing, there's soot shown in sample number 1 from the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot shown in sample number 2 from the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Can you explain why there is 50 plus level of soot in sample number 1, but no soot in sample number	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. The that's yeah. That's the magnification. Q. Okay. Now, if we go to your comments after the tables, right now I'm looking at the Rocky Waters Motor Inn Report. That's Exhibit 3. A. Yes. And are a question. You're referring to the discussion section? Q. Well, I want to talk about methods first. A. Okay. Yes. Q. It says the Air-O cassette traces were identified under light microscopy viewed at 100x, 200x and 400x, correct? A. Yes. Q. I thought you said your microscope only went to 60x. A. No. 600. It's the 60x is the magnification. There's a 10. Good question. There's a 10x, 10x up here and 60 down here. Q. Ah. A. And that goes
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	there, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. For one thing, there's soot at Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot over at the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you explain MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. MR. DEVILLING: Yeah. Let me restate that question. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) so, for one thing, there's soot shown in sample number 1 from the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot shown in sample number 2 from the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Can you explain why there is 50 plus level of soot in sample number 1, but no soot in sample number 2?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. The that's yeah. That's the magnification. Q. Okay. Now, if we go to your comments after the tables, right now I'm looking at the Rocky Waters Motor Inn Report. That's Exhibit 3. A. Yes. And are a question. You're referring to the discussion section? Q. Well, I want to talk about methods first. A. Okay. Yes. Q. It says the Air-O cassette traces were identified under light microscopy viewed at 100x, 200x and 400x, correct? A. Yes. Q. I thought you said your microscope only went to 60x. A. No. 600. It's the 60x is the magnification. There's a 10. Good question. There's a 10x, 10x up here and 60 down here. Q. Ah. A. And that goes Q. Okay.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. For one thing, there's soot at Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot over at the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you explain MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. MR. DEVILLING: Yeah. Let me restate that question. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) so, for one thing, there's soot shown in sample number 1 from the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot shown in sample number 2 from the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Can you explain why there is 50 plus level of soot in sample number 1, but no soot in sample number 2? A. It would require me to speculate.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. The that's yeah. That's the magnification. Q. Okay. Now, if we go to your comments after the tables, right now I'm looking at the Rocky Waters Motor Inn Report. That's Exhibit 3. A. Yes. And are a question. You're referring to the discussion section? Q. Well, I want to talk about methods first. A. Okay. Yes. Q. It says the Air-O cassette traces were identified under light microscopy viewed at 100x, 200x and 400x, correct? A. Yes. Q. I thought you said your microscope only went to 60x. A. No. 600. It's the 60x is the magnification. There's a 10. Good question. There's a 10x, 10x up here and 60 down here. Q. Ah. A. And that goes Q. Okay. A. So thank you for clarifying that.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	there, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. For one thing, there's soot at Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot over at the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you explain MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. MR. DEVILLING: Yeah. Let me restate that question. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) so, for one thing, there's soot shown in sample number 1 from the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot shown in sample number 2 from the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Can you explain why there is 50 plus level of soot in sample number 1, but no soot in sample number 2? A. It would require me to speculate. Q. Okay. And can you tell me why there's a difference in	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. The that's yeah. That's the magnification. Q. Okay. Now, if we go to your comments after the tables, right now I'm looking at the Rocky Waters Motor Inn Report. That's Exhibit 3. A. Yes. And are a question. You're referring to the discussion section? Q. Well, I want to talk about methods first. A. Okay. Yes. Q. It says the Air-O cassette traces were identified under light microscopy viewed at 100x, 200x and 400x, correct? A. Yes. Q. I thought you said your microscope only went to 60x. A. No. 600. It's the 60x is the magnification. There's a 10. Good question. There's a 10x, 10x up here and 60 down here. Q. Ah. A. And that goes Q. Okay. A. So thank you for clarifying that. Q. Thank you for clarifying.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	there, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. For one thing, there's soot at Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot over at the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you explain MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. MR. DEVILLING: Yeah. Let me restate that question. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) so, for one thing, there's soot shown in sample number 1 from the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot shown in sample number 2 from the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Can you explain why there is 50 plus level of soot in sample number 1, but no soot in sample number 2? A. It would require me to speculate. Q. Okay. And can you tell me why there's a difference in the proportion of char to soot in as between sample	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. The that's yeah. That's the magnification. Q. Okay. Now, if we go to your comments after the tables, right now I'm looking at the Rocky Waters Motor Inn Report. That's Exhibit 3. A. Yes. And are a question. You're referring to the discussion section? Q. Well, I want to talk about methods first. A. Okay. Yes. Q. It says the Air-O cassette traces were identified under light microscopy viewed at 100x, 200x and 400x, correct? A. Yes. Q. I thought you said your microscope only went to 60x. A. No. 600. It's the 60x is the magnification. There's a 10. Good question. There's a 10x, 10x up here and 60 down here. Q. Ah. A. And that goes Q. Okay. A. So thank you for clarifying that. Q. Thank you for clarifying. A. Yes.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	there, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. For one thing, there's soot at Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot over at the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you explain MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. MR. DEVILLING: Yeah. Let me restate that question. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) so, for one thing, there's soot shown in sample number 1 from the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot shown in sample number 2 from the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Can you explain why there is 50 plus level of soot in sample number 1, but no soot in sample number 2? A. It would require me to speculate. Q. Okay. And can you tell me why there's a difference in the proportion of char to soot in as between sample number 1 and sample number 2?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. The that's yeah. That's the magnification. Q. Okay. Now, if we go to your comments after the tables, right now I'm looking at the Rocky Waters Motor Inn Report. That's Exhibit 3. A. Yes. And are a question. You're referring to the discussion section? Q. Well, I want to talk about methods first. A. Okay. Yes. Q. It says the Air-O cassette traces were identified under light microscopy viewed at 100x, 200x and 400x, correct? A. Yes. Q. I thought you said your microscope only went to 60x. A. No. 600. It's the 60x is the magnification. There's a 10. Good question. There's a 10x, 10x up here and 60 down here. Q. Ah. A. And that goes Q. Okay. A. So thank you for clarifying that. Q. Thank you for clarifying. A. Yes. Q. That's what I was
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	there, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. For one thing, there's soot at Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot over at the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you explain MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. MR. DEVILLING: Yeah. Let me restate that question. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) so, for one thing, there's soot shown in sample number 1 from the Rocky Waters Motor Inn, but no soot shown in sample number 2 from the Days Inn, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. Can you explain why there is 50 plus level of soot in sample number 1, but no soot in sample number 2? A. It would require me to speculate. Q. Okay. And can you tell me why there's a difference in the proportion of char to soot in as between sample	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. The that's yeah. That's the magnification. Q. Okay. Now, if we go to your comments after the tables, right now I'm looking at the Rocky Waters Motor Inn Report. That's Exhibit 3. A. Yes. And are a question. You're referring to the discussion section? Q. Well, I want to talk about methods first. A. Okay. Yes. Q. It says the Air-O cassette traces were identified under light microscopy viewed at 100x, 200x and 400x, correct? A. Yes. Q. I thought you said your microscope only went to 60x. A. No. 600. It's the 60x is the magnification. There's a 10. Good question. There's a 10x, 10x up here and 60 down here. Q. Ah. A. And that goes Q. Okay. A. So thank you for clarifying that. Q. Thank you for clarifying. A. Yes.

	Page 54		Page 56
1	top that's 10 and the other, that's 60. At the bottom,	1	Q. Okay. But when you make a decision as to which area of
2	you put it together, you get 600, correct?	2	the field in the microscope to zoom in on, are you
3	A. That's correct. Yes.	3	typically then choosing to zoom in on a denser area?
4	Q. Okay. Thank you. And then to change the magnification,	4	A. I'll look at all of the areas. So that so that's
5	you just change out the lens at the top, correct?	5	what you'll see in some cases where you'll see a range,
6	A. You change out the lens at the bottom.	6	because the number of particles, particularly more so on
7	Q. Ah, okay.	7	the tease tape samples aren't evenly distributed. So
8	A. 10 always stays up at the top, and then you change the	8	there will be some areas where it's really dense and
9	ones at the bottom.	9	some others that aren't. And that's what kind of puts a
10	Q. Okay. My mind's still stuck in the microscope I used in	10	variability in in that number. You'll see like 20 to
11	fifth grade I think.	11	30 because some areas are more dense than others.
12	It says Lacto fuchsin stain in 85 percent lactic	12	Q. Okay. You testified I think you testified earlier
13	acid was used to aid in identification. Can you explain	13	that you you will look at the entire tape area under
14	what that means?	14	the microscope during your analysis, correct?
15	A. Sure. Lacto fuchsin is a stain I use primarily for	15	A. As much as I can, and in some cases, if it's fairly
16	fungal organisms. Although, it does help separate out	16	obvious that we've got a problem, I'm not going to look
17	some of the soot and char particles and make them a	17	at everything. And in some cases, as I do a scan, it
18	little more easier to observe under the microscope.	18	seems to be fairly uniform, then I will focus on a small
19	Q. Okay.	19	area. And that's particularly with a tape sample where
20	A. It gives it a slight reddish tint to the background.	20	it's a huge area to look at. So I'll focus in on a
21	Q. Okay. And back to this, you said you viewed it at three	21	couple of them that seem to be more representative than
22	different magnifications; 100x, 200x and 400x. When	22	than the whole piece. With respect to the
23	you're doing the particle counts above in the table, are	23	Air-O-Cell, I will look at the whole trace.
24	those particle counts based on the view at 100, 200 or	24	Q. Can you tell me what what percentage of the area of
25	400?	25	the tape sample you end up viewing at 400 times
	Page 55		Page 57
1	A. The particle counts are based at 400.	1	magnification?
2	Q. Okay. And when you're when you're at a 100x and	2	A. It really varies. Sometimes it would be 5 to 10
3	you're looking down at the the field through the	3	percent. Other times maybe 40 or 50. It depends. And
4	microscope, do you make a decision as to what part of	4	then also sometimes the tape that they give me will
5	that field you want to zoom in on next?	5	either be really wide or narrow. And if it's a really
6	A. Yes. I typically will do a full scan. For instance, at	6	wide tape, then the percentage would be down because it
7	100x or 200x to kind of find out what what particles	7	will be covering some areas. In other areas I won't
8	appear to be interesting and then will zoom down on some	8	look at terribly closely if there's a lot of debris that
9	that I'm I'm trying to figure out if they're soot or	9	makes it impossible to see through. So I'm looking for
10	char, and then I can zoom back and then start doing the	10	something that looks for instance, I'll see some dark
11	counting, but I just want to see if there's for	11	shadows in there, but I can't tell what they are. Then
12	instance, on the ones that are really light, I'll just	12	I'll move over to a spot that's a little clearer, and I
— 1	go through and say I don't see much here at all. I've	13	can clarify whether what I'm seeing.
13		14	Q. Do you know what kind of tape FBS uses to collect their
14	got to zoom in and see if I can find one or two or	1	
14 15	something like that.	15	samples?
14 15 16	something like that. Q. Mm-hmm. Do you typically zoom in to areas that are more	15 16	A. I it appears to be Scotch 3M 600. It's the red
14 15 16 17	something like that. Q. Mm-hmm. Do you typically zoom in to areas that are more dense?	15 16 17	A. I it appears to be Scotch 3M 600. It's the red tartan tape. It's the clear tape.
14 15 16 17 18	something like that. Q. Mm-hmm. Do you typically zoom in to areas that are more dense? A. Yeah. At least on the initial scan, just to find out	15 16 17 18	A. I it appears to be Scotch 3M 600. It's the red tartan tape. It's the clear tape. Q. Okay.
14 15 16 17 18 19	something like that. Q. Mm-hmm. Do you typically zoom in to areas that are more dense? A. Yeah. At least on the initial scan, just to find out what type, what's going on there, what does it look	15 16 17 18 19	A. I it appears to be Scotch 3M 600. It's the red tartan tape. It's the clear tape. Q. Okay. A. That's the one I've told them to use. Yeah.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	something like that. Q. Mm-hmm. Do you typically zoom in to areas that are more dense? A. Yeah. At least on the initial scan, just to find out what type, what's going on there, what does it look like. Is it for instance, from afar, from a	15 16 17 18 19 20	A. I it appears to be Scotch 3M 600. It's the red tartan tape. It's the clear tape. Q. Okay. A. That's the one I've told them to use. Yeah. Q. All right. Do you know if there are tapes manufactured
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	something like that. Q. Mm-hmm. Do you typically zoom in to areas that are more dense? A. Yeah. At least on the initial scan, just to find out what type, what's going on there, what does it look like. Is it for instance, from afar, from a distance, in other words, so, if I'm looking at 100x,	15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. I it appears to be Scotch 3M 600. It's the red tartan tape. It's the clear tape. Q. Okay. A. That's the one I've told them to use. Yeah. Q. All right. Do you know if there are tapes manufactured specifically for the purpose of collecting surface
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	something like that. Q. Mm-hmm. Do you typically zoom in to areas that are more dense? A. Yeah. At least on the initial scan, just to find out what type, what's going on there, what does it look like. Is it for instance, from afar, from a distance, in other words, so, if I'm looking at 100x, it's difficult for me to discern whether the dark	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. I it appears to be Scotch 3M 600. It's the red tartan tape. It's the clear tape. Q. Okay. A. That's the one I've told them to use. Yeah. Q. All right. Do you know if there are tapes manufactured specifically for the purpose of collecting surface samples?
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	something like that. Q. Mm-hmm. Do you typically zoom in to areas that are more dense? A. Yeah. At least on the initial scan, just to find out what type, what's going on there, what does it look like. Is it for instance, from afar, from a distance, in other words, so, if I'm looking at 100x, it's difficult for me to discern whether the dark cluster would be maybe a cluster of fungal particles or	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. I it appears to be Scotch 3M 600. It's the red tartan tape. It's the clear tape. Q. Okay. A. That's the one I've told them to use. Yeah. Q. All right. Do you know if there are tapes manufactured specifically for the purpose of collecting surface samples? A. I've seen some that have been used. So, yes, I would
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	something like that. Q. Mm-hmm. Do you typically zoom in to areas that are more dense? A. Yeah. At least on the initial scan, just to find out what type, what's going on there, what does it look like. Is it for instance, from afar, from a distance, in other words, so, if I'm looking at 100x, it's difficult for me to discern whether the dark	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. I it appears to be Scotch 3M 600. It's the red tartan tape. It's the clear tape. Q. Okay. A. That's the one I've told them to use. Yeah. Q. All right. Do you know if there are tapes manufactured specifically for the purpose of collecting surface samples?

	Page 58		Page 60
1	then they will switch over to the Scotch 600 if it's an	1	A. Those are typically they can break into smaller
2	area where it's difficult. For instance, like a curved	2	particles like soot, but they're typically very
3	surface or a difficult surface, then they'll switch over	3	spheroidal. So there will be a cluster into a sphere,
4	to the tape.	4	as opposed to that rough configuration that you would
5	Q. If you go out and collect samples, what kind of tape do	5	have with a soot that looks like very tiny grapes. This
6	you use?	6	would be a very black sphere, and it typically will
7	A. I use the Scotch 600	7	range in between, oh, let's say 3 microns in size to 20
8	Q. Okay.	8	to 30 microns in size.
9	A because of the optical properties.	9	Q, And that's that's how it appears under the
10	Q. It's clearer?	10	microscope, right?
11	A. It's clear. It's not like the Magic tape, the green	11	A. That's how it appears under the microscope, yes.
12	tape where you have all this debris in front. You can't	12	Q. And what I'm actually wondering is just what are carbon
13	see through it.	13	black particles, just what kinds of materials?
14	Q. Under methods, it then says no chemical identification	14	A. You could produce them like from a copy machine, very
15	was conducted on the soot-like, char-like particles and	15	similar to it. You'll have a so they're it's
16	carbon black-like particles do you see that?	16	essentially strictly made out of carbon, and they tend
17	A. Yes.	17	to agglomerate based on the temp and I'm not an
18	Q. And is that a reference to the fact you're doing a Level	18	expert with respect to the temperature required for the
19	1 analysis as opposed to a Level 4?	19	production of it. But they will agglomerate much
20	A. Yes.	20	differently than the soot particles.
21	Q. Okay. It says soot-like. What do you mean by soot-like	21	Q. Do they come from specific types of materials?
22	particles?	22	A. I'm not I'm not sure of all of the materials where
23	A. It means that the analysis that I'm doing is there are	23	that comes from.
24	other particles that could be similar to soot and would	24	Q. Okay.
25	look visually similar upon identification. So I'm doing	25	A. No.
-			
	Page 59		Page 61
1	Page 59 a presumptive analysis of soot. So I'm saying this	1	$\mbox{Page 61} \\ \mbox{Q}_{\mbox{\tiny e}} \mbox{ By the way, did you were you looking at all for ash?}$
1 2	_	1 2	
	a presumptive analysis of soot. So I'm saying this	1	$Q_{\scriptscriptstyle{\rm E}}$ By the way, did you were you looking at all for ash?
2	a presumptive analysis of soot. So I'm saying this appears to be soot to me. It has optical properties for	2	$Q_{\rm e}$ By the way, did you were you looking at all for ash? A. I was not.
2	a presumptive analysis of soot. So I'm saying this appears to be soot to me. It has optical properties for it, but, if you want to do more thorough analysis, you	2	Q. By the way, did you were you looking at all for ash? A. I was not. Q. Okay. And you understand that ash is a different
2 3 4	a presumptive analysis of soot. So I'm saying this appears to be soot to me. It has optical properties for it, but, if you want to do more thorough analysis, you can go to a Level 4 to make sure that that that that	2 3 4	Q. By the way, did you were you looking at all for ash? A. I was not. Q. Okay. And you understand that ash is a different substance than char and soot?
2 3 4 5	a presumptive analysis of soot. So I'm saying this appears to be soot to me. It has optical properties for it, but, if you want to do more thorough analysis, you can go to a Level 4 to make sure that that that that presumption that I'm making in this case is correct.	2 3 4 5	 Q_e By the way, did you were you looking at all for ash? A. I was not. Q. Okay. And you understand that ash is a different substance than char and soot? A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6	a presumptive analysis of soot. So I'm saying this appears to be soot to me. It has optical properties for it, but, if you want to do more thorough analysis, you can go to a Level 4 to make sure that that that that presumption that I'm making in this case is correct. Q. Okay, What other kinds of particles look like soot?	2 3 4 5 6	 Q_e By the way, did you were you looking at all for ash? A. I was not. Q. Okay. And you understand that ash is a different substance than char and soot? A. Yes. Q. By the way, how would you define char?
2 3 4 5 6 7	a presumptive analysis of soot. So I'm saying this appears to be soot to me. It has optical properties for it, but, if you want to do more thorough analysis, you can go to a Level 4 to make sure that that that that presumption that I'm making in this case is correct. Q. Okay, What other kinds of particles look like soot? A. There are a couple different ones, and they'll typically	2 3 4 5 6	 Q_* By the way, did you were you looking at all for ash? A. I was not. Q. Okay. And you understand that ash is a different substance than char and soot? A. Yes. Q. By the way, how would you define char? A. Char would be a typically a product of combustion that results in plainer, typically opaque to moderately opaque material that has some of the original
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a presumptive analysis of soot. So I'm saying this appears to be soot to me. It has optical properties for it, but, if you want to do more thorough analysis, you can go to a Level 4 to make sure that that that that presumption that I'm making in this case is correct. Q. Okay, What other kinds of particles look like soot? A. There are a couple different ones, and they'll typically manifest slightly different. But paint particles, for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q_* By the way, did you were you looking at all for ash? A. I was not. Q. Okay. And you understand that ash is a different substance than char and soot? A. Yes. Q. By the way, how would you define char? A. Char would be a typically a product of combustion that results in plainer, typically opaque to moderately opaque material that has some of the original constituent of the material that's burned, and it will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a presumptive analysis of soot. So I'm saying this appears to be soot to me. It has optical properties for it, but, if you want to do more thorough analysis, you can go to a Level 4 to make sure that that that that presumption that I'm making in this case is correct. Q. Okay, What other kinds of particles look like soot? A. There are a couple different ones, and they'll typically manifest slightly different. But paint particles, for instance, spray paint particles, if they're aerosolized and they break up, they'll typically be they'll typically be in spheres, but sometimes the spheres break	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q_* By the way, did you were you looking at all for ash? A. I was not. Q. Okay. And you understand that ash is a different substance than char and soot? A. Yes. Q. By the way, how would you define char? A. Char would be a typically a product of combustion that results in plainer, typically opaque to moderately opaque material that has some of the original constituent of the material that's burned, and it will have a very flat sheetlike appearance. So the aspect
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a presumptive analysis of soot. So I'm saying this appears to be soot to me. It has optical properties for it, but, if you want to do more thorough analysis, you can go to a Level 4 to make sure that that that that presumption that I'm making in this case is correct. Q. Okay. What other kinds of particles look like soot? A. There are a couple different ones, and they'll typically manifest slightly different. But paint particles, for instance, spray paint particles, if they're aerosolized and they break up, they'll typically be they'll typically be in spheres, but sometimes the spheres break up, and they can look somewhat similar to a soot-like	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q_e By the way, did you were you looking at all for ash? A. I was not. Q. Okay. And you understand that ash is a different substance than char and soot? A. Yes. Q. By the way, how would you define char? A. Char would be a typically a product of combustion that results in plainer, typically opaque to moderately opaque material that has some of the original constituent of the material that's burned, and it will have a very flat sheetlike appearance. So the aspect ratio is very thin, and it will have much more length
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a presumptive analysis of soot. So I'm saying this appears to be soot to me. It has optical properties for it, but, if you want to do more thorough analysis, you can go to a Level 4 to make sure that that that that presumption that I'm making in this case is correct. Q. Okay, What other kinds of particles look like soot? A. There are a couple different ones, and they'll typically manifest slightly different. But paint particles, for instance, spray paint particles, if they're aerosolized and they break up, they'll typically be they'll typically be in spheres, but sometimes the spheres break up, and they can look somewhat similar to a soot-like particle. If a if some of the carbon-like particles	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q_a By the way, did you were you looking at all for ash? A. I was not. Q. Okay. And you understand that ash is a different substance than char and soot? A. Yes. Q. By the way, how would you define char? A. Char would be a typically a product of combustion that results in plainer, typically opaque to moderately opaque material that has some of the original constituent of the material that's burned, and it will have a very flat sheetlike appearance. So the aspect ratio is very thin, and it will have much more length and width, and it will have sharp edges under light
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a presumptive analysis of soot. So I'm saying this appears to be soot to me. It has optical properties for it, but, if you want to do more thorough analysis, you can go to a Level 4 to make sure that that that that presumption that I'm making in this case is correct. Q. Okay. What other kinds of particles look like soot? A. There are a couple different ones, and they'll typically manifest slightly different. But paint particles, for instance, spray paint particles, if they're aerosolized and they break up, they'll typically be they'll typically be in spheres, but sometimes the spheres break up, and they can look somewhat similar to a soot-like particle. If a if some of the carbon-like particles will break up, you'll also see something that looks	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q_a By the way, did you were you looking at all for ash? A. I was not. Q. Okay. And you understand that ash is a different substance than char and soot? A. Yes. Q. By the way, how would you define char? A. Char would be a typically a product of combustion that results in plainer, typically opaque to moderately opaque material that has some of the original constituent of the material that's burned, and it will have a very flat sheetlike appearance. So the aspect ratio is very thin, and it will have much more length and width, and it will have sharp edges under light microscopy.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a presumptive analysis of soot. So I'm saying this appears to be soot to me. It has optical properties for it, but, if you want to do more thorough analysis, you can go to a Level 4 to make sure that that that that presumption that I'm making in this case is correct. Q. Okay. What other kinds of particles look like soot? A. There are a couple different ones, and they'll typically manifest slightly different. But paint particles, for instance, spray paint particles, if they're aerosolized and they break up, they'll typically be they'll typically be in spheres, but sometimes the spheres break up, and they can look somewhat similar to a soot-like particle. If a if some of the carbon-like particles will break up, you'll also see something that looks fairly similar to to soot. And there may be some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q_a By the way, did you were you looking at all for ash? A. I was not. Q. Okay. And you understand that ash is a different substance than char and soot? A. Yes. Q. By the way, how would you define char? A. Char would be a typically a product of combustion that results in plainer, typically opaque to moderately opaque material that has some of the original constituent of the material that's burned, and it will have a very flat sheetlike appearance. So the aspect ratio is very thin, and it will have much more length and width, and it will have sharp edges under light microscopy. Q_b How do you define soot?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a presumptive analysis of soot. So I'm saying this appears to be soot to me. It has optical properties for it, but, if you want to do more thorough analysis, you can go to a Level 4 to make sure that that that that presumption that I'm making in this case is correct. Q. Okay, What other kinds of particles look like soot? A. There are a couple different ones, and they'll typically manifest slightly different. But paint particles, for instance, spray paint particles, if they're aerosolized and they break up, they'll typically be they'll typically be in spheres, but sometimes the spheres break up, and they can look somewhat similar to a soot-like particle. If a if some of the carbon-like particles will break up, you'll also see something that looks fairly similar to to soot. And there may be some other ones that I can't recall off off the top of my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. By the way, did you were you looking at all for ash? A. I was not. Q. Okay. And you understand that ash is a different substance than char and soot? A. Yes. Q. By the way, how would you define char? A. Char would be a typically a product of combustion that results in plainer, typically opaque to moderately opaque material that has some of the original constituent of the material that's burned, and it will have a very flat sheetlike appearance. So the aspect ratio is very thin, and it will have much more length and width, and it will have sharp edges under light microscopy. Q. How do you define soot? A. Soot would be submicron sized spheroidal particles that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a presumptive analysis of soot. So I'm saying this appears to be soot to me. It has optical properties for it, but, if you want to do more thorough analysis, you can go to a Level 4 to make sure that that that that presumption that I'm making in this case is correct. Q. Okay, What other kinds of particles look like soot? A. There are a couple different ones, and they'll typically manifest slightly different. But paint particles, for instance, spray paint particles, if they're aerosolized and they break up, they'll typically be they'll typically be in spheres, but sometimes the spheres break up, and they can look somewhat similar to a soot-like particle. If a if some of the carbon-like particles will break up, you'll also see something that looks fairly similar to to soot. And there may be some other ones that I can't recall off off the top of my head. There's some mineral deposits or minerals that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. By the way, did you were you looking at all for ash? A. I was not. Q. Okay. And you understand that ash is a different substance than char and soot? A. Yes. Q. By the way, how would you define char? A. Char would be a typically a product of combustion that results in plainer, typically opaque to moderately opaque material that has some of the original constituent of the material that's burned, and it will have a very flat sheetlike appearance. So the aspect ratio is very thin, and it will have much more length and width, and it will have sharp edges under light microscopy. Q. How do you define soot? A. Soot would be submicron sized spheroidal particles that are aggregated in microscopic grapelike structures that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a presumptive analysis of soot. So I'm saying this appears to be soot to me. It has optical properties for it, but, if you want to do more thorough analysis, you can go to a Level 4 to make sure that that that that presumption that I'm making in this case is correct. Q. Okay, What other kinds of particles look like soot? A. There are a couple different ones, and they'll typically manifest slightly different. But paint particles, for instance, spray paint particles, if they're aerosolized and they break up, they'll typically be they'll typically be in spheres, but sometimes the spheres break up, and they can look somewhat similar to a soot-like particle. If a if some of the carbon-like particles will break up, you'll also see something that looks fairly similar to to soot. And there may be some other ones that I can't recall off off the top of my head. There's some mineral deposits or minerals that will look somewhat similar; although, they're the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. By the way, did you were you looking at all for ash? A. I was not. Q. Okay. And you understand that ash is a different substance than char and soot? A. Yes. Q. By the way, how would you define char? A. Char would be a typically a product of combustion that results in plainer, typically opaque to moderately opaque material that has some of the original constituent of the material that's burned, and it will have a very flat sheetlike appearance. So the aspect ratio is very thin, and it will have much more length and width, and it will have sharp edges under light microscopy. Q. How do you define soot? A. Soot would be submicron sized spheroidal particles that are aggregated in microscopic grapelike structures that have rough edges, and they're produced as a part of a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a presumptive analysis of soot. So I'm saying this appears to be soot to me. It has optical properties for it, but, if you want to do more thorough analysis, you can go to a Level 4 to make sure that that that that presumption that I'm making in this case is correct. Q. Okay, What other kinds of particles look like soot? A. There are a couple different ones, and they'll typically manifest slightly different. But paint particles, for instance, spray paint particles, if they're aerosolized and they break up, they'll typically be they'll typically be in spheres, but sometimes the spheres break up, and they can look somewhat similar to a soot-like particle. If a if some of the carbon-like particles will break up, you'll also see something that looks fairly similar to to soot. And there may be some other ones that I can't recall off off the top of my head. There's some mineral deposits or minerals that will look somewhat similar; although, they're the light refraction on it is slightly different. But,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. By the way, did you were you looking at all for ash? A. I was not. Q. Okay. And you understand that ash is a different substance than char and soot? A. Yes. Q. By the way, how would you define char? A. Char would be a typically a product of combustion that results in plainer, typically opaque to moderately opaque material that has some of the original constituent of the material that's burned, and it will have a very flat sheetlike appearance. So the aspect ratio is very thin, and it will have much more length and width, and it will have sharp edges under light microscopy. Q. How do you define soot? A. Soot would be submicron sized spheroidal particles that are aggregated in microscopic grapelike structures that have rough edges, and they're produced as a part of a combustion process, typically different than the process
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a presumptive analysis of soot. So I'm saying this appears to be soot to me. It has optical properties for it, but, if you want to do more thorough analysis, you can go to a Level 4 to make sure that that that that presumption that I'm making in this case is correct. Q. Okay. What other kinds of particles look like soot? A. There are a couple different ones, and they'll typically manifest slightly different. But paint particles, for instance, spray paint particles, if they're aerosolized and they break up, they'll typically be they'll typically be in spheres, but sometimes the spheres break up, and they can look somewhat similar to a soot-like particle. If a if some of the carbon-like particles will break up, you'll also see something that looks fairly similar to to soot. And there may be some other ones that I can't recall off off the top of my head. There's some mineral deposits or minerals that will look somewhat similar; although, they're the light refraction on it is slightly different. But, again, if it's a really heavy, dense piece, then I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. By the way, did you were you looking at all for ash? A. I was not. Q. Okay. And you understand that ash is a different substance than char and soot? A. Yes. Q. By the way, how would you define char? A. Char would be a typically a product of combustion that results in plainer, typically opaque to moderately opaque material that has some of the original constituent of the material that's burned, and it will have a very flat sheetlike appearance. So the aspect ratio is very thin, and it will have much more length and width, and it will have sharp edges under light microscopy. Q. How do you define soot? A. Soot would be submicron sized spheroidal particles that are aggregated in microscopic grapelike structures that have rough edges, and they're produced as a part of a combustion process, typically different than the process of char-like particles.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a presumptive analysis of soot. So I'm saying this appears to be soot to me. It has optical properties for it, but, if you want to do more thorough analysis, you can go to a Level 4 to make sure that that that that presumption that I'm making in this case is correct. Q. Okay. What other kinds of particles look like soot? A. There are a couple different ones, and they'll typically manifest slightly different. But paint particles, for instance, spray paint particles, if they're aerosolized and they break up, they'll typically be they'll typically be in spheres, but sometimes the spheres break up, and they can look somewhat similar to a soot-like particle. If a if some of the carbon-like particles will break up, you'll also see something that looks fairly similar to to soot. And there may be some other ones that I can't recall off off the top of my head. There's some mineral deposits or minerals that will look somewhat similar; although, they're the light refraction on it is slightly different. But, again, if it's a really heavy, dense piece, then I'm having a difficult time trying to do that, and I would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. By the way, did you were you looking at all for ash? A. I was not. Q. Okay. And you understand that ash is a different substance than char and soot? A. Yes. Q. By the way, how would you define char? A. Char would be a typically a product of combustion that results in plainer, typically opaque to moderately opaque material that has some of the original constituent of the material that's burned, and it will have a very flat sheetlike appearance. So the aspect ratio is very thin, and it will have much more length and width, and it will have sharp edges under light microscopy. Q. How do you define soot? A. Soot would be submicron sized spheroidal particles that are aggregated in microscopic grapelike structures that have rough edges, and they're produced as a part of a combustion process, typically different than the process of char-like particles. Q. And then how would you define ash?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a presumptive analysis of soot. So I'm saying this appears to be soot to me. It has optical properties for it, but, if you want to do more thorough analysis, you can go to a Level 4 to make sure that that — that that presumption that I'm making in this case is correct. Q. Okay. What other kinds of particles look like soot? A. There are a couple different ones, and they'll typically manifest slightly different. But paint particles, for instance, spray paint particles, if they're aerosolized and they break up, they'll typically be — they'll typically be in spheres, but sometimes the spheres break up, and they can look somewhat similar to a soot-like particle. If a — if some of the carbon-like particles will break up, you'll also see something that looks fairly similar to — to soot. And there may be some other ones that I can't recall off — off the top of my head. There's some mineral deposits or minerals that will look somewhat similar; although, they're — the light refraction on it is slightly different. But, again, if it's a really heavy, dense piece, then I'm having a difficult time trying to do that, and I would say, you know, I'd make some notes on that one.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. By the way, did you were you looking at all for ash? A. I was not. Q. Okay. And you understand that ash is a different substance than char and soot? A. Yes. Q. By the way, how would you define char? A. Char would be a typically a product of combustion that results in plainer, typically opaque to moderately opaque material that has some of the original constituent of the material that's burned, and it will have a very flat sheetlike appearance. So the aspect ratio is very thin, and it will have much more length and width, and it will have sharp edges under light microscopy. Q. How do you define soot? A. Soot would be submicron sized spheroidal particles that are aggregated in microscopic grapelike structures that have rough edges, and they're produced as a part of a combustion process, typically different than the process of char-like particles. Q. And then how would you define ash? A. Ash would be the mineral, minerals that are typically
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a presumptive analysis of soot. So I'm saying this appears to be soot to me. It has optical properties for it, but, if you want to do more thorough analysis, you can go to a Level 4 to make sure that that — that that presumption that I'm making in this case is correct. Q. Okay, What other kinds of particles look like soot? A. There are a couple different ones, and they'll typically manifest slightly different. But paint particles, for instance, spray paint particles, if they're aerosolized and they break up, they'll typically be — they'll typically be in spheres, but sometimes the spheres break up, and they can look somewhat similar to a soot-like particle. If a — if some of the carbon-like particles will break up, you'll also see something that looks fairly similar to — to soot. And there may be some other ones that I can't recall off — off the top of my head. There's some mineral deposits or minerals that will look somewhat similar; although, they're — the light refraction on it is slightly different. But, again, if it's a really heavy, dense piece, then I'm having a difficult time trying to do that, and I would say, you know, I'd make some notes on that one. Q. Okay. And you list three types of particles here;	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. By the way, did you were you looking at all for ash? A. I was not. Q. Okay. And you understand that ash is a different substance than char and soot? A. Yes. Q. By the way, how would you define char? A. Char would be a typically a product of combustion that results in plainer, typically opaque to moderately opaque material that has some of the original constituent of the material that's burned, and it will have a very flat sheetlike appearance. So the aspect ratio is very thin, and it will have much more length and width, and it will have sharp edges under light microscopy. Q. How do you define soot? A. Soot would be submicron sized spheroidal particles that are aggregated in microscopic grapelike structures that have rough edges, and they're produced as a part of a combustion process, typically different than the process of char-like particles. Q. And then how would you define ash? A. Ash would be the mineral, minerals that are typically released during the production of fire.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a presumptive analysis of soot. So I'm saying this appears to be soot to me. It has optical properties for it, but, if you want to do more thorough analysis, you can go to a Level 4 to make sure that that — that that presumption that I'm making in this case is correct. Q. Okay. What other kinds of particles look like soot? A. There are a couple different ones, and they'll typically manifest slightly different. But paint particles, for instance, spray paint particles, if they're aerosolized and they break up, they'll typically be — they'll typically be in spheres, but sometimes the spheres break up, and they can look somewhat similar to a soot-like particle. If a — if some of the carbon-like particles will break up, you'll also see something that looks fairly similar to — to soot. And there may be some other ones that I can't recall off — off the top of my head. There's some mineral deposits or minerals that will look somewhat similar; although, they're — the light refraction on it is slightly different. But, again, if it's a really heavy, dense piece, then I'm having a difficult time trying to do that, and I would say, you know, I'd make some notes on that one.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. By the way, did you were you looking at all for ash? A. I was not. Q. Okay. And you understand that ash is a different substance than char and soot? A. Yes. Q. By the way, how would you define char? A. Char would be a typically a product of combustion that results in plainer, typically opaque to moderately opaque material that has some of the original constituent of the material that's burned, and it will have a very flat sheetlike appearance. So the aspect ratio is very thin, and it will have much more length and width, and it will have sharp edges under light microscopy. Q. How do you define soot? A. Soot would be submicron sized spheroidal particles that are aggregated in microscopic grapelike structures that have rough edges, and they're produced as a part of a combustion process, typically different than the process of char-like particles. Q. And then how would you define ash? A. Ash would be the mineral, minerals that are typically

1	Page 62		Page 64
1	is the least combusted and ash would be the final	1	A. Well, that sounds good.
2	product of combustion?	2	Q. Usually when Clint speaks, I learn:
3	A. I I don't know.	3	A. Eighteen samples in
4	Q. Oh, okay. All right. And then it says under methods,	4	Q. All right. So Exhibit 2, Days Inn, we've got a total of
5	presumptive identification was based on particle	5	20 samples, correct?
6	morphology, correct?	6	A. Yes.
7	A. Yeah.	7	Q. All right. And of those 20 samples, how many samples do
8	Q. And I think we've already pretty much touched on that.	8	you have pictures of?
9	And then you've got photographs attached to Exhibit 3	9	A. Six.
10	here. It looks like just three photographs, correct?	10	Q. And then in the other report, Exhibit 3, how many
11	A. That's correct. Yeah.	11	different samples did you analyze?
12	Q. And are these photographs that were actually taken from	12	A. Did I I analyzed let me check for a final number
13	the samples you analyzed?	13	there. Eighteen.
14	A. Yeah. Yes. That's correct.	14	Q. And how many photographs do you have? It looks like
15	Q. Did you take any more photographs than these three?	15	three different samples of photographs, correct?
16	A. I probably did, and I I chose the ones that seemed to	16	A. Yes.
17	be the most relevant to	17	MR. DEVILLING: We've been going a while.
18	Q. Okay. Do you know if you still have all of the	18	Why don't we take about a five-minute break?
19	photographs that you took?	19	THE WITNESS: Okay
20	A. I do not know that.	20	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Very good.
21	Q. I'm sorry. You do not know?	21	MR. SCOTT: All right.
22	A. I do not know if I do.	22	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the
23	Q. Okay.	23	record and the time is 2:25 p.m.
24	A. I sometimes look for them and not found them. So	24	(Break taken at 2:25 p.m 2:33 p.m.)
25	Q. Okay.	25	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the
	Page 63		Page 65
1	A in the past.	1	record, and the time is 2:33 p.m.
2	Q. On Exhibit 2, it looks like you included eight	2	
3			Q. (MR. DEVILLING) Okay. In looking at any of the samples
	photographs, correct?	3	Q. (MR. DEVILLING) Okay. In looking at any of the samples that you reviewed in this case for either hotel, did you
4	photographs, correct? A. Let's see. Well, I've got one, two, three, four, five,	3 4	
4 5		1	that you reviewed in this case for either hotel, did you
	A. Let's see. Well, I've got one, two, three, four, five,	4	that you reviewed in this case for either hotel, did you find any traces of chemical fire retardant in the
5	A. Let's see. Well, I've got one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Yep.	4 5	that you reviewed in this case for either hotel, did you find any traces of chemical fire retardant in the samples?
5 6	A. Let's see. Well, I've got one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Yep. Q. So it looks like a total, between the two reports,	4 5 6	that you reviewed in this case for either hotel, did you find any traces of chemical fire retardant in the samples? A. I was not analyzing for that, no.
5 6 7	A. Let's see. Well, I've got one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Yep. Q. So it looks like a total, between the two reports, you've got 11 photographs total, correct?	4 5 6 7	that you reviewed in this case for either hotel, did you find any traces of chemical fire retardant in the samples? A. I was not analyzing for that, no. Q. Okay. Did you see anything that you thought was trace
5 6 7 8	A. Let's see. Well, I've got one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Yep. Q. So it looks like a total, between the two reports, you've got 11 photographs total, correct? A. Yes.	4 5 6 7 8	that you reviewed in this case for either hotel, did you find any traces of chemical fire retardant in the samples? A. I was not analyzing for that, no. Q. Okay. Did you see anything that you thought was trace amount of fire retardant?
5 6 7 8 9	A. Let's see. Well, I've got one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Yep. Q. So it looks like a total, between the two reports, you've got 11 photographs total, correct? A. Yes. Q. How many different samples do you have photographs of in	4 5 6 7 8	that you reviewed in this case for either hotel, did you find any traces of chemical fire retardant in the samples? A. I was not analyzing for that, no. Q. Okay. Did you see anything that you thought was trace amount of fire retardant? A. I would not know it if I saw it.
5 6 7 8 9	A. Let's see. Well, I've got one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Yep. Q. So it looks like a total, between the two reports, you've got 11 photographs total, correct? A. Yes. Q. How many different samples do you have photographs of in this report?	4 5 6 7 8 9	that you reviewed in this case for either hotel, did you find any traces of chemical fire retardant in the samples? A. I was not analyzing for that, no. Q. Okay. Did you see anything that you thought was trace amount of fire retardant? A. I would not know it if I saw it. Q. Okay. Are you aware and if this is outside of your
5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. Let's see. Well, I've got one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Yep. Q. So it looks like a total, between the two reports, you've got 11 photographs total, correct? A. Yes. Q. How many different samples do you have photographs of in this report? A. One. Let's see. One, two. 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that you reviewed in this case for either hotel, did you find any traces of chemical fire retardant in the samples? A. I was not analyzing for that, no. Q. Okay. Did you see anything that you thought was trace amount of fire retardant? A. I would not know it if I saw it. Q. Okay. Are you aware and if this is outside of your expertise, that's fine. Just let me know. But are you
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A. Let's see. Well, I've got one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Yep. Q. So it looks like a total, between the two reports, you've got 11 photographs total, correct? A. Yes. Q. How many different samples do you have photographs of in this report? A. One. Let's see. One, two. MR. SCOTT: Which report? 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that you reviewed in this case for either hotel, did you find any traces of chemical fire retardant in the samples? A. I was not analyzing for that, no. Q. Okay. Did you see anything that you thought was trace amount of fire retardant? A. I would not know it if I saw it. Q. Okay.: Are you aware and if this is outside of your expertise, that's fine. Just let me know. But are you aware of any regulations governing cleanup of wildfire debris? A. I don't know specifically on regulations.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Let's see. Well, I've got one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Yep. Q. So it looks like a total, between the two reports, you've got 11 photographs total, correct? A. Yes. Q. How many different samples do you have photographs of in this report? A. One. Let's see. One, two. MR. SCOTT: Which report? MR. DEVILLING: Let me let me strike	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that you reviewed in this case for either hotel, did you find any traces of chemical fire retardant in the samples? A. I was not analyzing for that, no. Q. Okay. Did you see anything that you thought was trace amount of fire retardant? A. I would not know it if I saw it. Q. Okay.: Are you aware and if this is outside of your expertise, that's fine. Just let me know. But are you aware of any regulations governing cleanup of wildfire debris? A. I don't know specifically on regulations. Q. All right. In terms of recommendations for remediating
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Let's see. Well, I've got one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Yep. Q. So it looks like a total, between the two reports, you've got 11 photographs total, correct? A. Yes. Q. How many different samples do you have photographs of in this report? A. One. Let's see. One, two. MR. SCOTT: Which report? MR. DEVILLING: Let me let me strike that.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that you reviewed in this case for either hotel, did you find any traces of chemical fire retardant in the samples? A. I was not analyzing for that, no. Q. Okay. Did you see anything that you thought was trace amount of fire retardant? A. I would not know it if I saw it. Q. Okay. Are you aware and if this is outside of your expertise, that's fine. Just let me know. But are you aware of any regulations governing cleanup of wildfire debris? A. I don't know specifically on regulations. Q. All right. In terms of recommendations for remediating any debris there, is that something you would defer to
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Let's see. Well, I've got one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Yep. Q. So it looks like a total, between the two reports, you've got 11 photographs total, correct? A. Yes. Q. How many different samples do you have photographs of in this report? A. One. Let's see. One, two. MR. SCOTT: Which report? MR. DEVILLING: Let me let me strike that. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) How many samples do you have	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that you reviewed in this case for either hotel, did you find any traces of chemical fire retardant in the samples? A. I was not analyzing for that, no. Q. Okay. Did you see anything that you thought was trace amount of fire retardant? A. I would not know it if I saw it. Q. Okay. Are you aware and if this is outside of your expertise, that's fine. Just let me know. But are you aware of any regulations governing cleanup of wildfire debris? A. I don't know specifically on regulations. Q. All right. In terms of recommendations for remediating any debris there, is that something you would defer to Mr. Irmiter on?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Let's see. Well, I've got one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Yep. Q. So it looks like a total, between the two reports, you've got 11 photographs total, correct? A. Yes. Q. How many different samples do you have photographs of in this report? A. One. Let's see. One, two. MR. SCOTT: Which report? MR. DEVILLING: Let me let me strike that. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) How many samples do you have photographs of in both reports? A. Okay. One Q. That's still a poor question. Let me strike that.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that you reviewed in this case for either hotel, did you find any traces of chemical fire retardant in the samples? A. I was not analyzing for that, no. Q. Okay. Did you see anything that you thought was trace amount of fire retardant? A. I would not know it if I saw it. Q. Okay. Are you aware and if this is outside of your expertise, that's fine. Just let me know. But are you aware of any regulations governing cleanup of wildfire debris? A. I don't know specifically on regulations. Q. All right. In terms of recommendations for remediating any debris there, is that something you would defer to Mr. Irmiter on? A. I would do that, yes.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Let's see. Well, I've got one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Yep. Q. So it looks like a total, between the two reports, you've got 11 photographs total, correct? A. Yes. Q. How many different samples do you have photographs of in this report? A. One. Let's see. One, two. MR. SCOTT: Which report? MR. DEVILLING: Let me let me strike that. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) How many samples do you have photographs of in both reports? A. Okay. One	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that you reviewed in this case for either hotel, did you find any traces of chemical fire retardant in the samples? A. I was not analyzing for that, no. Q. Okay. Did you see anything that you thought was trace amount of fire retardant? A. I would not know it if I saw it. Q. Okay. Are you aware and if this is outside of your expertise, that's fine. Just let me know. But are you aware of any regulations governing cleanup of wildfire debris? A. I don't know specifically on regulations. Q. All right. In terms of recommendations for remediating any debris there, is that something you would defer to Mr. Irmiter on? A. I would do that, yes. Q. Okay. I noticed there's no specific recommendations
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Let's see. Well, I've got one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Yep. Q. So it looks like a total, between the two reports, you've got 11 photographs total, correct? A. Yes. Q. How many different samples do you have photographs of in this report? A. One. Let's see. One, two. MR. SCOTT: Which report? MR. DEVILLING: Let me let me strike that. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) How many samples do you have photographs of in both reports? A. Okay. One Q. That's still a poor question. Let me strike that.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that you reviewed in this case for either hotel, did you find any traces of chemical fire retardant in the samples? A. I was not analyzing for that, no. Q. Okay. Did you see anything that you thought was trace amount of fire retardant? A. I would not know it if I saw it. Q. Okay. Are you aware and if this is outside of your expertise, that's fine. Just let me know. But are you aware of any regulations governing cleanup of wildfire debris? A. I don't know specifically on regulations. Q. All right. In terms of recommendations for remediating any debris there, is that something you would defer to Mr. Irmiter on? A. I would do that, yes. Q. Okay. I noticed there's no specific recommendations contained in either of your reports, correct?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Let's see. Well, I've got one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Yep. Q. So it looks like a total, between the two reports, you've got 11 photographs total, correct? A. Yes. Q. How many different samples do you have photographs of in this report? A. One. Let's see. One, two. MR. SCOTT: Which report? MR. DEVILLING: Let me let me strike that. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) How many samples do you have photographs of in both reports? A. Okay. One Q. That's still a poor question. Let me strike that. A. Okay.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that you reviewed in this case for either hotel, did you find any traces of chemical fire retardant in the samples? A. I was not analyzing for that, no. Q. Okay. Did you see anything that you thought was trace amount of fire retardant? A. I would not know it if I saw it. Q. Okay. Are you aware and if this is outside of your expertise, that's fine. Just let me know. But are you aware of any regulations governing cleanup of wildfire debris? A. I don't know specifically on regulations. Q. All right. In terms of recommendations for remediating any debris there, is that something you would defer to Mr. Irmiter on? A. I would do that, yes. Q. Okay. I noticed there's no specific recommendations contained in either of your reports, correct? A. That is correct.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Let's see. Well, I've got one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Yep. Q. So it looks like a total, between the two reports, you've got 11 photographs total, correct? A. Yes. Q. How many different samples do you have photographs of in this report? A. One. Let's see. One, two. MR. SCOTT: Which report? MR. DEVILLING: Let me let me strike that. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) How many samples do you have photographs of in both reports? A. Okay. One Q. That's still a poor question. Let me strike that. A. Okay. Q. There are 20 samples total between the two reports,	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that you reviewed in this case for either hotel, did you find any traces of chemical fire retardant in the samples? A. I was not analyzing for that, no. Q. Okay. Did you see anything that you thought was trace amount of fire retardant? A. I would not know it if I saw it. Q. Okay. Are you aware and if this is outside of your expertise, that's fine. Just let me know. But are you aware of any regulations governing cleanup of wildfire debris? A. I don't know specifically on regulations. Q. All right. In terms of recommendations for remediating any debris there, is that something you would defer to Mr. Irmiter on? A. I would do that, yes. Q. Okay. I noticed there's no specific recommendations contained in either of your reports, correct? A. That is correct. Q. Okay. Your report has dates on which the cassette
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Let's see. Well, I've got one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Yep. Q. So it looks like a total, between the two reports, you've got 11 photographs total, correct? A. Yes. Q. How many different samples do you have photographs of in this report? A. One. Let's see. One, two. MR. SCOTT: Which report? MR. DEVILLING: Let me let me strike that. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) How many samples do you have photographs of in both reports? A. Okay. One Q. That's still a poor question. Let me strike that. A. Okay. Q. There are 20 samples total between the two reports, correct? A. Let's count that up. Q. No. That's not even correct.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that you reviewed in this case for either hotel, did you find any traces of chemical fire retardant in the samples? A. I was not analyzing for that, no. Q. Okay. Did you see anything that you thought was trace amount of fire retardant? A. I would not know it if I saw it. Q. Okay. Are you aware and if this is outside of your expertise, that's fine. Just let me know. But are you aware of any regulations governing cleanup of wildfire debris? A. I don't know specifically on regulations. Q. All right. In terms of recommendations for remediating any debris there, is that something you would defer to Mr. Irmiter on? A. I would do that, yes. Q. Okay. I noticed there's no specific recommendations contained in either of your reports, correct? A. That is correct. Q. Okay. Your report has dates on which the cassette samples and tape samples were taken. I've got
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Let's see. Well, I've got one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Yep. Q. So it looks like a total, between the two reports, you've got 11 photographs total, correct? A. Yes. Q. How many different samples do you have photographs of in this report? A. One. Let's see. One, two. MR. SCOTT: Which report? MR. DEVILLING: Let me let me strike that. Q. (MR. DEVILLING) How many samples do you have photographs of in both reports? A. Okay. One Q. That's still a poor question. Let me strike that. A. Okay. Q. There are 20 samples total between the two reports, correct? A. Let's count that up.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that you reviewed in this case for either hotel, did you find any traces of chemical fire retardant in the samples? A. I was not analyzing for that, no. Q. Okay. Did you see anything that you thought was trace amount of fire retardant? A. I would not know it if I saw it. Q. Okay. Are you aware and if this is outside of your expertise, that's fine. Just let me know. But are you aware of any regulations governing cleanup of wildfire debris? A. I don't know specifically on regulations. Q. All right. In terms of recommendations for remediating any debris there, is that something you would defer to Mr. Irmiter on? A. I would do that, yes. Q. Okay. I noticed there's no specific recommendations contained in either of your reports, correct? A. That is correct. Q. Okay. Your report has dates on which the cassette

	Page 66		Page 68
1	on the Rocky Waters Motor Inn on your reports.	1	it's different between the tease tape and the
2	Do you have any opinion as to whether there are	2	Air-O-Cell. Would you like me to clarify that, or
3	advantages to taking samples closer in time to the	3	Q. Sure.
4	event?	4	A. Sure. With the tease tape sample, the slide is placed
5	A. I need to think about that. It's it's helpful on the	5	down. The mounting fluid is placed on the slide, and
6	Air-O-Cell cassette if you are taking them immediately	6	then the tape is placed over that. And then I described
7	after rather than at a longer time since because you	7	previously how the Air-O-Cell is put together.
8	have a chance to see that suspension that's in the air	8	Q. Okay. Did you use any polarized light in your
9	immediately after the smoke event. And then the people	9	microscopy?
10	that are actually taking the sample that have experience	10	A. There was no polarized light. It was optical light
11	with fire remediation can take that into account, the	11	microscopy.
12	time differential.	12	Q. Did you use any reflected light?
13	Q. Do you agree that air samples are just a snapshot in	13	A. I'm not sure exactly what you're referring to on that.
14	time of the air at a given location?	14	Q. Is there a microscopy technique known as that's a
15	A. Yes.	15	reflective light technique?
16	Q. What is gas-phase soot, if you know?	16	A. I'm not using a specific reflective light technique.
17	A. I'm not familiar with that term.	17	Q. Okay. Is there a microscopy technique known as dark
18	Q. Okay. Do you know whether the and this might be an	18	field illumination?
19	obvious question. Maybe not. But the particles that	19	A. There is one, but I didn't use it.
20	you're looking at under a microscope, those are	20	MR. DEVILLING: Okay Okay Those are all
21	solid-phase particles, correct? In other words	21	the questions I have. Thank you for your time.
22	A. I would think they would be because again, I that	22	THE WITNESS: You're welcome, sir. How long
23	term, that differentiation between solid and gas phase	23	are you here?
24	is something I haven't looked at specifically.	24	MR, SCOTT: No questions. Neil will read
25	Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the different forms of	25	and sign.
1	Page 67		Page 69
1	Page 6/	1	Page 69 THE WITNESS: All right.
1 2		1 2	
	soot, such as aciniform carbon, carbonaceous xerogel	1	THE WITNESS: All right.
2 3 4	soot, such as aciniform carbon, carbonaceous xerogel particles, carbon cenospheres, and coke and char fragments? MR. SCOTT: Object to the form.	2	THE WITNESS: All right. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: And we are going off the
2 3 4 5	soot, such as aciniform carbon, carbonaceous xerogel particles, carbon cenospheres, and coke and char fragments?	2	THE WITNESS: All right. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: And we are going off the record, and the time is now 2:40 p.m.
2 3 4 5 6	soot, such as aciniform carbon, carbonaceous xerogel particles, carbon cenospheres, and coke and char fragments? MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. THE WITNESS: Just clarification, do I still answer, or is that just a	2 3 4 5 6	THE WITNESS: All right. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: And we are going off the record, and the time is now 2:40 p.m. (Whereupon, the deposition concludes at
2 3 4 5 6 7	soot, such as aciniform carbon, carbonaceous xerogel particles, carbon cenospheres, and coke and char fragments? MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. THE WITNESS: Just clarification, do I still answer, or is that just a MR. SCOTT: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS: All right. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: And we are going off the record, and the time is now 2:40 p.m. (Whereupon, the deposition concludes at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	soot, such as aciniform carbon, carbonaceous xerogel particles, carbon cenospheres, and coke and char fragments? MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. THE WITNESS: Just clarification, do I still answer, or is that just a MR. SCOTT: Yes. THE WITNESS: Okay. All right. Just want	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS: All right. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: And we are going off the record, and the time is now 2:40 p.m. (Whereupon, the deposition concludes at
2 3 4 5 6 7	soot, such as aciniform carbon, carbonaceous xerogel particles, carbon cenospheres, and coke and char fragments? MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. THE WITNESS: Just clarification, do I still answer, or is that just a MR. SCOTT: Yes. THE WITNESS: Okay. All right. Just want to make sure that okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS: All right. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: And we are going off the record, and the time is now 2:40 p.m. (Whereupon, the deposition concludes at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	soot, such as aciniform carbon, carbonaceous xerogel particles, carbon cenospheres, and coke and char fragments? MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. THE WITNESS: Just clarification, do I still answer, or is that just a MR. SCOTT: Yes. THE WITNESS: Okay. All right. Just want to make sure that okay. A. The aciniform I'm somewhat familiar with, and that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS: All right. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: And we are going off the record, and the time is now 2:40 p.m. (Whereupon, the deposition concludes at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	soot, such as aciniform carbon, carbonaceous xerogel particles, carbon cenospheres, and coke and char fragments? MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. THE WITNESS: Just clarification, do I still answer, or is that just a MR. SCOTT: Yes. THE WITNESS: Okay. All right. Just want to make sure that okay. A. The aciniform I'm somewhat familiar with, and that's what I've described for you. That's the grapelike	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS: All right. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: And we are going off the record, and the time is now 2:40 p.m. (Whereupon, the deposition concludes at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	soot, such as aciniform carbon, carbonaceous xerogel particles, carbon cenospheres, and coke and char fragments? MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. THE WITNESS: Just clarification, do I still answer, or is that just a MR. SCOTT: Yes. THE WITNESS: Okay. All right. Just want to make sure that okay. A. The aciniform I'm somewhat familiar with, and that's what I've described for you. That's the grapelike structures. The other three I'm not as familiar with.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS: All right. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: And we are going off the record, and the time is now 2:40 p.m. (Whereupon, the deposition concludes at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	soot, such as aciniform carbon, carbonaceous xerogel particles, carbon cenospheres, and coke and char fragments? MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. THE WITNESS: Just clarification, do I still answer, or is that just a MR. SCOTT: Yes. THE WITNESS: Okay. All right. Just want to make sure that okay. A. The aciniform I'm somewhat familiar with, and that's what I've described for you. That's the grapelike structures. The other three I'm not as familiar with. Q. Okay. So we're dealing with aciniform carbons here in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS: All right. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: And we are going off the record, and the time is now 2:40 p.m. (Whereupon, the deposition concludes at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	soot, such as aciniform carbon, carbonaceous xerogel particles, carbon cenospheres, and coke and char fragments? MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. THE WITNESS: Just clarification, do I still answer, or is that just a MR. SCOTT: Yes. THE WITNESS: Okay. All right. Just want to make sure that okay. A. The aciniform I'm somewhat familiar with, and that's what I've described for you. That's the grapelike structures. The other three I'm not as familiar with. Q. Okay. So we're dealing with aciniform carbons here in this case; is that correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS: All right. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: And we are going off the record, and the time is now 2:40 p.m. (Whereupon, the deposition concludes at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	soot, such as aciniform carbon, carbonaceous xerogel particles, carbon cenospheres, and coke and char fragments? MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. THE WITNESS: Just clarification, do I still answer, or is that just a MR. SCOTT: Yes. THE WITNESS: Okay. All right. Just want to make sure that okay. A. The aciniform I'm somewhat familiar with, and that's what I've described for you. That's the grapelike structures. The other three I'm not as familiar with. Q. Okay. So we're dealing with aciniform carbons here in this case; is that correct? A. Yeah. The ones that I'm seeing are more that that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS: All right. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: And we are going off the record, and the time is now 2:40 p.m. (Whereupon, the deposition concludes at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	soot, such as aciniform carbon, carbonaceous xerogel particles, carbon cenospheres, and coke and char fragments? MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. THE WITNESS: Just clarification, do I still answer, or is that just a MR. SCOTT: Yes. THE WITNESS: Okay. All right. Just want to make sure that okay. A. The aciniform I'm somewhat familiar with, and that's what I've described for you. That's the grapelike structures. The other three I'm not as familiar with. Q. Okay. So we're dealing with aciniform carbons here in this case; is that correct? A. Yeah. The ones that I'm seeing are more that that I'm able to see and that I've now there may be the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS: All right. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: And we are going off the record, and the time is now 2:40 p.m. (Whereupon, the deposition concludes at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	soot, such as aciniform carbon, carbonaceous xerogel particles, carbon cenospheres, and coke and char fragments? MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. THE WITNESS: Just clarification, do I still answer, or is that just a MR. SCOTT: Yes. THE WITNESS: Okay. All right. Just want to make sure that okay. A. The aciniform I'm somewhat familiar with, and that's what I've described for you. That's the grapelike structures. The other three I'm not as familiar with. Q. Okay. So we're dealing with aciniform carbons here in this case; is that correct? A. Yeah. The ones that I'm seeing are more that that I'm able to see and that I've now there may be the other ones may have been present, but I've been focused	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS: All right. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: And we are going off the record, and the time is now 2:40 p.m. (Whereupon, the deposition concludes at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	soot, such as aciniform carbon, carbonaceous xerogel particles, carbon cenospheres, and coke and char fragments? MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. THE WITNESS: Just clarification, do I still answer, or is that just a MR. SCOTT: Yes. THE WITNESS: Okay. All right. Just want to make sure that okay. A. The aciniform I'm somewhat familiar with, and that's what I've described for you. That's the grapelike structures. The other three I'm not as familiar with. Q. Okay. So we're dealing with aciniform carbons here in this case; is that correct? A. Yeah. The ones that I'm seeing are more that that I'm able to see and that I've now there may be the other ones may have been present, but I've been focused on the aciniform.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS: All right. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: And we are going off the record, and the time is now 2:40 p.m. (Whereupon, the deposition concludes at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	soot, such as aciniform carbon, carbonaceous xerogel particles, carbon cenospheres, and coke and char fragments? MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. THE WITNESS: Just clarification, do I still answer, or is that just a MR. SCOTT: Yes. THE WITNESS: Okay. All right. Just want to make sure that okay. A. The aciniform I'm somewhat familiar with, and that's what I've described for you. That's the grapelike structures. The other three I'm not as familiar with. Q. Okay. So we're dealing with aciniform carbons here in this case; is that correct? A. Yeah. The ones that I'm seeing are more that that I'm able to see and that I've now there may be the other ones may have been present, but I've been focused on the aciniform. Q. Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS: All right. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: And we are going off the record, and the time is now 2:40 p.m. (Whereupon, the deposition concludes at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	soot, such as aciniform carbon, carbonaceous xerogel particles, carbon cenospheres, and coke and char fragments? MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. THE WITNESS: Just clarification, do I still answer, or is that just a MR. SCOTT: Yes. THE WITNESS: Okay. All right. Just want to make sure that okay. A. The aciniform I'm somewhat familiar with, and that's what I've described for you. That's the grapelike structures. The other three I'm not as familiar with. Q. Okay. So we're dealing with aciniform carbons here in this case; is that correct? A. Yeah. The ones that I'm seeing are more that that I'm able to see and that I've now there may be the other ones may have been present, but I've been focused on the aciniform. Q. Okay. A. And to clarify, that's with respect to soot.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS: All right. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: And we are going off the record, and the time is now 2:40 p.m. (Whereupon, the deposition concludes at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	soot, such as aciniform carbon, carbonaceous xerogel particles, carbon cenospheres, and coke and char fragments? MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. THE WITNESS: Just clarification, do I still answer, or is that just a MR. SCOTT: Yes. THE WITNESS: Okay. All right. Just want to make sure that okay. A. The aciniform I'm somewhat familiar with, and that's what I've described for you. That's the grapelike structures. The other three I'm not as familiar with. Q. Okay. So we're dealing with aciniform carbons here in this case; is that correct? A. Yeah. The ones that I'm seeing are more that that I'm able to see and that I've now there may be the other ones may have been present, but I've been focused on the aciniform. Q. Okay. A. And to clarify, that's with respect to soot. Q. Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS: All right. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: And we are going off the record, and the time is now 2:40 p.m. (Whereupon, the deposition concludes at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	soot, such as aciniform carbon, carbonaceous xerogel particles, carbon cenospheres, and coke and char fragments? MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. THE WITNESS: Just clarification, do I still answer, or is that just a MR. SCOTT: Yes. THE WITNESS: Okay. All right. Just want to make sure that okay. A. The aciniform I'm somewhat familiar with, and that's what I've described for you. That's the grapelike structures. The other three I'm not as familiar with. Q. Okay. So we're dealing with aciniform carbons here in this case; is that correct? A. Yeah. The ones that I'm seeing are more that that I'm able to see and that I've now there may be the other ones may have been present, but I've been focused on the aciniform. Q. Okay. A. And to clarify, that's with respect to soot. Q. Okay. A. Yeah.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS: All right. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: And we are going off the record, and the time is now 2:40 p.m. (Whereupon, the deposition concludes at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	soot, such as aciniform carbon, carbonaceous xerogel particles, carbon cenospheres, and coke and char fragments? MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. THE WITNESS: Just clarification, do I still answer, or is that just a MR. SCOTT: Yes. THE WITNESS: Okay. All right. Just want to make sure that okay. A. The aciniform I'm somewhat familiar with, and that's what I've described for you. That's the grapelike structures. The other three I'm not as familiar with. Q. Okay. So we're dealing with aciniform carbons here in this case; is that correct? A. Yeah. The ones that I'm seeing are more that that I'm able to see and that I've now there may be the other ones may have been present, but I've been focused on the aciniform. Q. Okay. A. And to clarify, that's with respect to soot. Q. Okay. A. Yeah. Q. What kind of mounting medium is used under the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS: All right. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: And we are going off the record, and the time is now 2:40 p.m. (Whereupon, the deposition concludes at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	soot, such as aciniform carbon, carbonaceous xerogel particles, carbon cenospheres, and coke and char fragments? MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. THE WITNESS: Just clarification, do I still answer, or is that just a MR. SCOTT: Yes. THE WITNESS: Okay. All right. Just want to make sure that okay. A. The aciniform I'm somewhat familiar with, and that's what I've described for you. That's the grapelike structures. The other three I'm not as familiar with. Q. Okay. So we're dealing with aciniform carbons here in this case; is that correct? A. Yeah. The ones that I'm seeing are more that that I'm able to see and that I've now there may be the other ones may have been present, but I've been focused on the aciniform. Q. Okay. A. And to clarify, that's with respect to soot. Q. Okay. A. Yeah.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS: All right. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: And we are going off the record, and the time is now 2:40 p.m. (Whereupon, the deposition concludes at

	Page 70	
1	ERRATA SHEET	
2	Page/Ln Correction Reason	
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
-	Page 71	
1		
1	I, Neil G. Carlson, have read this transcript, pages 1 -	
2	69, and acknowledge herein its accuracy except as noted	
3	on the errata sheet.	
4		
5		
6	+	
7	Signature	
8		
9		
10	-	
11	Notary Public	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

	Page 72
1	STATE OF MINNESOTA
1 2 3 4	CERTIFICATE
3	COUNTY OF CARVER
4	I, Christine M. Clark, RPR, hereby certify
	that I reported the Videotape Deposition of Neil G.
5	Carlson on this 28th day of February, 2020, in
	Minneapolis, Minnesota, and that the witness was by me
6	first duly sworn to tell the truth and nothing but the
	truth concerning the matter in controversy aforesaid;
7	,
	That I was then and there a notary public in and
8	for the County of Carver, State of Minnesota; that by
	virtue thereof I was duly authorized to
9	administer an oath;
10	That the foregoing transcript is a true and
	correct transcript of my stenographic notes in
11	said matter, transcribed under my direction and
l .	control;
12	
	That the cost of the original has been
13	charged to the party who noticed the deposition and
	that all parties who ordered copies have been
14	charged at the same rate for such copies;
15	That the reading and signing of the
	deposition was not waived;
16	T1 - 1 T
4.7	That I am not related to any of the
17	parties hereto, nor interested in the outcome of the
10	action and have no contract with any parties,
18	attorneys or persons with an interest in the action
10	that has a substantial tendency to affect my
19	impartiality;
20	WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL this 3rd day of March 2020.
21	Maich 2020.
21 22	
~~	
23	Christine M. Clark, RPR
23	Notary Public
24	rectary rabite
25	

Page 73

t					rage 75
	ř			r i	ř.
Α	aid 54:13	21:12,15	10:20,20	better 31:7	carbonaceous
	air 6:19,21	23:21 35:6	assist 6:17	beyond 16:7	67:1
able 31:4 40:12	10:19,20	48:9 65:6	23:20	20:17 26:21	carbons 67:13
55:24 67:16					
above-entitled	23:15 38:19	annually 12:12	assistant 23:23	26:21 27:5	career 8:17
4:24	38:22,23	answer 5:12,17	assisting 6:23	big 34:20	Carlson 1:19
acceptable	39:3 66:8,13	33:16 34:23	associated	Biology 8:6	4:1,7,23 5:4
10:10	66:14	40:13 46:8	21:7 33:14	bit 16:24 28:4	6:4,4,10,12
	Air-O 53:10	46:14,18	39:3	31:7 45:24	9:19 10:16
accepted 40:25	Air-O-Cell	47:1 52:7	Association	black 32:4 60:6	10:17 11:9
account 66:11	17:25 29:17	67:6	21:18 28:20	60:13	71:1 72:5
accreditation					
21:3,11,14,16	29:18,22	anticipate 31:3	assume 8:18	black-like	Carlson's 3:7
21:19 28:4,7	30:7,23,24	anyone's 13:6	25:18 45:13	58:16 59:24	Carver 72:3,8
28:13,18,20	33:1,4 35:7	apart 39:1	assuming	59:25	case 4:9 5:6
29:2	41:6 56:23	apparently	11:11	BOBBITT 2:3	6:6,7 7:13,20
accredited	66:6 68:2,7	13:2	attached 62:9	bolded 19:8	15:8 19:3
	Alliance 26:14	appear 55:8	attempting	bottom 54:1,6	22:11 24:16
21:9,24 22:4	26:23	appearance	14:19	54:9	25:11,25
22:20,21	allowed 45:15	31:23 61:11	attend 7:14	box 25:10 29:8	26:7 30:6
28:22,23,25					
accuracy 71:2	amber 32:5	APPEARANCES	attorneys 4:15	boxes 27:24	37:2,6 50:4
accurate 10:1	America 1:6	2:1	72:18	Boynton 30:21	59:5 65:3
10:1 14:11	4:9	Appearing 2:7	authorized	brand 16:3	67:14
19:25	American	appears 57:16	72:8	break 5:15	cases 9:4 13:1
acid 54:13	21:17 28:19	59:2 60:9,11	available 15:6	16:24 59:10	35:8 38:21
	amount 31:10	apply 5:11	15:18	59:11,14	56:5,15,17
aciniform 67:1	65:8	approached	average 33:8	60:1 64:18	cassette 29:17
67:10,13,18	analysis 6:17	30:15	aware 28:9,15	64:24	29:19,22
acknowledge			,		· ·
71:2	7:2,3,15,22	appropriately	45:16,19	Brian 2:13 4:17	30:7,23,24
action 4:24	7:24 8:15,16	23:10	65:10,12	5:4	33:1,4 53:10
72:17,18	10:18,18,21	approximate		brings 40:24	65:22 66:6
actual 36:25	10:22,23	34:12	В	budget 45:14	caused 9:6
37:5	11:1,2,25	approximately	back 14:21	building 9:8	20:11
	12:6 13:11	10:14,15	43:12 52:24	12:18,19	ceiling 47:23
add 8:23	13:13,15,16	17:1 33:5	54:21 55:10	13:10 14:4	cell 10:9
added 7:11	15:4,13 16:5	34:8,10	64:25	23:3,11,12,18	cenospheres
additional 7:10		approximation		45:18	67:2
18:17,19	17:3,5,6,10		background		
20:17	17:14,15,16	34:25	22:23,25	buildings 23:2	Center 6:24
address 15:15	17:24 18:2,6	architecture	54:20	23:4	certain 17:17
15:16	18:9,11,23	6:21	bag 29:9	built 57:25	52:22
adjunct 6:15	20:13,25	area 27:11	ball-parking	bulk 18:1	Certainly 9:25
administer	21:8 22:10	52:15 56:1,3	38:5	burn 32:3	27:9
72:9	26:12,22	56:13,19,20	ballpark 38:10	burned 30:22	CERTIFICATE
	27:4,16	56:24 58:2	39:23	31:6 61:10	72:2
advantages	28:10,12,17	areas 19:8	based 26:18	burner 31:8	certification
66:3	28:25 30:16	55:16 56:4,8		burning 45:21	23:4
aerodynamics		'	27:2 37:11	46:12 52:2,3	certified 23:23
39:8	30:24 31:5,5	56:11 57:7,7	40:22 54:24	, ,	
aerosolized	32:25 37:3,4	ash 61:1,3,21	55:1 60:17	burnt 48:18	29:1
59:9	47:9 48:19	61:22 62:1	62:5	business 13:22	certify 72:4
afar 55:20	49:2 56:14	asked 17:4	basement		chain 27:12
affect 72:18	58:19,23	18:24 28:4	27:20	С	chains 15:9
	59:1,3	28:21 30:16	basically 47:16	California	chance 66:8
affiliated 6:5	Analytical 6:4	asking 5:12	basis 25:18	26:18	change 54:4,5
aforesaid 72:6	6:5,8,10,12	10:7 11:25	39:25	call 11:18 15:5	54:6,8
afternoon 4:5	9:20 10:16	17:6 28:11			char 8:24 9:16
Agency 4:3,14			bathroom	32:6	10:23 11:13
agglomerate	10:17 11:9	52:16	47:23	campus 6:20	
32:11 60:17	analyze 12:8	Asp/Pen 36:4	bdevilling@f	31:10	11:14 12:6
60:19	13:4 16:18	36:6,7,11,17	2:12	capable 17:2	13:15,16
aggregated	25:4 33:1	38:6	began 30:15	17:10	14:5,16
61:17	36:16 64:11	aspect 61:11	believe 7:5	carbon 58:16	18:11 27:2
	analyzed 8:18	aspects 7:21	11:21 12:24	59:24,25	28:10,13
agree 66:13	9:5,15 14:3	aspergillus	24:25 26:20	60:12,16	30:13,25
agreement	14:16,25	36:8,12		· ·	31:2,9,20,23
41:3		· ·	Benchmark 4:2	67:1,2	
Ah 45:3 47:20	62:13 64:12	asphalt 23:15	4:14	carbon-like	31:25 32:2
53:17 54:7	analyzing 8:1,3	assessments	best 14:22	59:13	32:13 33:7
					K.
k					

Page 74

			1	ří	ř
33:15,25	class 6:21	10:12 11:21	22:8,21,22	cubic 37:5,8	42:4,9 47:15
35:10,19	class 6.21	12:20 13:19	24:13 25:1	38:16 45:18	47:17,24
,					
37:3,21 38:1	cleanup 65:12	26:13,18	25:16,17,20	culturable	49:9,15
38:2 40:6	clear 29:2,5	compare 19:22	25:21 29:15	21:20	Department
41:23 42:1	30:1 33:19	31:16 50:18	34:4 35:20	current 5:24	6:1
42:15,15	57:17 58:11	comparing	35:23 36:5	7:8,9	depends 29:11
43:2,10,22,25	clearer 57:12	51:1	36:14,17	currently 5:25	33:10 38:21
			· ·	curved 58:2	45:11 57:3
44:2,3,7,11	58:10	complete 7:11	37:8 41:21		
44:13,17,21	clearly 40:1	20:3	41:24 42:3	custody 27:12	deposes 5:1
45:3,24 46:2	Clint 4:19 64:2	completeness	42:23,25	CV 3:7 7:5,21	deposition
46:6,10,16,19	Clinton 2:6	61:25	43:4,6,8,9,13	10:5	1:17 3:11 4:1
46:24 47:12	close 30:24	composition	43:15,20,21		4:7 5:7 69:4
48:10 49:1	40:23	17:13 18:3	43:22,25	D	72:4,13,15
				-	
49:21,23	closely 57:8	concentration	44:2,5,8,11	D 2:4 3:1	deposits 59:17
50:2,12,15	closer 66:3	20:21 47:25	44:13,17,22	damage 9:6	depth 32:8
51:22 52:13	cluster 55:23	concerning	45:4,25 46:4	23:2,19	describe 15:11
52:24 54:17	55:23 60:3	72:6	47:6,8,10,13	dark 32:13	described
55:10,24	clusters 32:12	concludes 69:4	48:14,16,23	55:22 57:10	17:18 41:21
	32:16	conducted	49:24,25		49:16 67:11
61:4,6,7,25				68:17	
67:2	CMU 33:22	58:15	50:10,13,16	darker 50:2	68:6
char-like 20:21	cognizant 21:7	configuration	50:25 51:3,6	dataset 11:6	describing
30:5 49:3	coke 67:2	60:4	51:15 52:22	date 10:1,10,14	49:9
58:15 59:24	collect 57:14	consider 7:22	52:23 53:1	27:14,15	DESCRIPTION
61:20	58:5	16:12 46:14	53:11 54:2,3	dates 65:22	3:6
characteriza	collecting	considered	54:5 56:14	day 4:2 72:5,20	designated
	57:21	39:25 41:9	59:5 62:6,10		36:7
39:16,17				Days 3:9 19:20	
characterized	collection	41:11	62:11,14	20:2,4 24:23	determination
41:16	30:19	constituent	63:3,7,21,23	25:15,19	30:7
characterizing	color 19:12	61:10	63:24 64:5	26:9 29:15	determine
20:18	colored 32:5	constitutes	64:15 65:20	36:17 50:19	14:19 17:12
charge 18:8,17	50:3	40:25	65:21 66:21	51:1,6,14	20:12 23:9
18:19,21,23	column 39:11	construction	67:14 72:10	64:4 65:25	27:4 40:4
18:25	47:15	22:23 23:1,4	Correction		45:13
		23:5	70:2	dead 48:14,16	determining
charged 72:13	combusted			deal 21:6	
72:14	62:1	construed 19:7	cost 72:12	dealing 67:13	8:20 9:16
check 64:12	combustion	consulting 6:3	count 11:6	debris 8:1,3,15	45:6
chemical 17:6	52:10 61:7	23:16 26:14	14:21 33:11	8:18 9:6,15	Develling 2:13
17:10,16	61:19,25	Consulting's	35:14 40:25	9:17 11:1	16:15
18:2,3,5	62:2	26:24	63:22	13:4,10 14:3	developing
20:23 58:14	come 15:2	contacted 13:3	counting 55:11	16:18 17:3	23:20
65:4	23:19 30:13	contained	counts 33:3		device 23:15
				57:8 58:12	
chemistry 8:6	39:15 40:10	65:20	41:16 54:23	65:13,16	Devilling 3:2
Chicago 2:11	60:21	container 29:6	54:24 55:1	decision 55:4	4:17,17 5:3,4
choose 32:23	comes 12:7	30:11	County 72:3,8	56:1	46:22 47:4
choosing 56:3	13:9 26:5	contains 8:20	couple 11:22	Defendant 1:7	51:10,12
chose 62:16	27:8 60:23	continuation	13:21 21:18	2:14	52:9 63:13
Christine 1:25	comfort 31:2	24:9	25:5 35:12	defer 65:16	63:15 64:17
4:12 72:4,23	comfortable	contract 72:17	56:21 59:7	define 61:6,15	65:2 68:20
circles 32:2	31:4	control 72:11	course 6:17,18		diameter 34:13
			,	61:21	
circumscribed	coming 15:6,9	controversy	6:24 24:6	defined 32:1	diameters
34:7	commencing	72:6	courses 6:16	definitely 9:13	34:10
claim 26:2	4:4	copies 19:14	7:1,2,3 23:24	12:12 14:8	differ 31:24
claims 9:5	comment	72:13,14	24:7,11	degree 8:5	difference
clarification	18:24	copy 7:5 19:19	court 1:1 4:10	23:24	17:21 51:21
11:12 67:5	comments 53:3	20:3,7 27:13	4:12,21 5:18	degrees 7:10	differences
clarify 9:1	communicati	47:8 60:14	cover 29:25	delivered	51:2
16:20 28:9	14:25 15:4	corner 27:19	covered 50:6		different 8:1
				25:11	
57:13 67:20	compact 16:24	correct 6:8,9	covering 57:7	dense 39:22	15:2 18:6
68:2	companies	6:11 7:5 8:8	coverslip 30:1	55:17 56:8	21:18 25:5
clarifying	11:10,22	8:9,11 10:10	coverslips	56:11 59:20	30:19,22
53:20,21	13:21,24	12:18,21	16:22	denser 56:3	31:1 33:3
Clark 1:25 4:12	company 1:6	19:19 20:4,7	cscott@gilbe	density 30:8	39:2 47:25
72:4,23	4:9 9:22,23	20:14,15	2:5	39:12 41:20	52:10,11
,				33.32 11.20	
	1		. "		

S4:22 59:7,8 28:4,21 S6:12 S6:	II.					Page 75
Soil	54.72 59.7 8	28.4.21	establishes	56:18 59:15	19:19 24:22	generally
Self-19 Say		· '				
66:12, differential 66:12 edges 32:1,4 around 66:13 differentiation 66:23 edifferential 61:13,18 education 24:9 estimates 26:1 differentiation 66:23 edifferential 53:15 doi:19.10.12 electrical 31:10 electrical					, ,	
66:12 66:12 67:13 67:14 67:1						_
differential						
66:12 classy 49:13 classy 49:1						
36:10.13 31:19 36:11.21 61:13.18 education 24:9 66:23 education 24:9 66:23 66:23 education 24:9 66:23 66:23 education 24:9 66:23 66:24 66:14 6	differentiate		evenly 56:7	,	flat 18:8,10	
differentation education 24:9 34:23 35:25 F8S 1:120,24 fluid 27:25 34:7,11 37:5 33:16 60:20 64:13 22:3 40:16 13:17 14:17 51:14 14:19 42:10 57:14 42:10 62:13 31:16 62:14 62:	30:13 31:19		event 66:4,9	45:14	61:11	11:3,8 14:6
differently 31:1 60:20 direction 72:11 direction 72:11 direction 72:11 direction 72:11 direction 72:12 discussion 20:20 20:317 disposal 20:20 disposal 20:20 disposal 20:20 disposal 20:20 disposal 20:20 disposal 20:20 distributed	36:10,12	61:13,18	exact 9:7 15:24	faulty 26:6	floor 27:20,21	18:24 20:20
differently 33:1 60:20 64:13 33:1 60:20 64:13 32:15 40:3 32:15 40:3 35:12 40:3	differentiation	education 24:9	34:23 35:25	FBS 11:20,24	fluid 27:25	34:7,11 37:5
33:160:20 64:13 62:32 30:16 64:13 52:32 30:16 63:13 53:15 60:33 53:15 60:33 53:15 60:33 53:15 63:13 53:15 63:13 53:15 63:13 53:15 63:13 53:15 63:13 53:15 63:13 53:15 63:13 63:14 63:14 63:13 63:14 63:14 63:13 63:14	66:23	eight 63:2,5	37:22 40:11	12:13,17	30:1 68:5	37:22,22
difficult 11:5 32:15 40:3 32:52 57:5 57:25 65:3 65:3 57:25 65:3 65:3 57:25 65:3 65:3 57:25 65:3 65:3 57:25 65:3 65:3 65:3 65:3 57:	differently	Eighteen 64:3	exactly 16:16	13:17 14:17		38:9 39:23
32:15 40:3 55:22 55:5 55:22 55:5 55:22 55:5 55:22 55:14 55:22 55:3 55:20 66:14	33:1 60:20				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	49:10 57:4
59:21 65:20 65:2	difficult 11:5			1 '		given 5:7 22:13
Signature Sign						'
direction 72::11 directions electrical 31::10 directions 35::19 47:22 districtions 48:13 49:8 elemental 17:3 discording feet 18:8 48:13 49:8 elemental 17:3 discording feet 18:0 48:13 49:8 elemental 17:3 discording feet 18:0 66:10 distributed distributed 25:24 disturbed 39:6 divide 33:13 dividing 33:22 Docket 15 56:13 entities 11:9 entities 11: 9 for 25:16 dropped 47:23 tile 49: 72: 50: 67: 25: 67: 25: 67: 25: 67: 25: 67: 25: 67: 25: 67: 25: 67: 25: 67: 25: 67: 25: 67: 25: 67: 25: 67: 25: 67: 25: 67: 25: 67: 25: 67: 25: 67: 25: 25: 25: 25: 25: 25: 25: 25: 25: 25						
directions 27:18 32:18 27:18 directly 12:8 directl				,		
27:18						
directly 12:8 elemental 17:3 35:4 fees 18:10 foregoing 35:13,15 42:1 49:7 72:10 72:1						· ·
13:4 30:2,3 17:13 email 2:5,12 Exeter 2:3 30:4 33:9,17 70:nesic 12:17 50:8 52:24 12:19 13:9 53:3 55:13 58:55:14 12:19 13:9 53:3 55:13 58:55:14 12:19 13:9 58:55:14 58:55:14 12:19 13:9 58:55:14 58:55:14 12:19 13:9 58:55:14 58:55:14 12:19 13:9 58:55:14 58:55:14 12:19 13:9 58:55:14 58:55:14 12:19 13:9 58:55:14 58:55:14 12:19 13:9 58:55:14 58:55:14 12:19 13:9 12:19 12:15 12:15 13:14 1						
discern 55:22 discussion 20:20 53:7 emails 14:20 19:19 20:3,6 35:7,11,15,18 14:4 58:55:13 66:10 67:21,10 75:10 67:21						
discussion 20:20 53:7 disposal 28:2 dispose 30:10 distance 55:21 distributed						
Decket 1:5 Constituted 39:16 Constituted 39:13 Constituted 39:16 Constituted 39:16 Constituted 39:16 Constituted 39:16 Constituted 39:16 Constituted 39:16 Constituted 39:18 Constituted 39:16 Constituted 39:18 Constituted 39:16 Constituted 39:18 Constituted 39:16 Constituted 39:18 Constituted						
disposal 28:2 dispose 30:10 distance 55:21 distinction 17:19 46:17 distance 55:21 distinction 17:19 46:17 distance 55:21 distinction 17:19 56:16 distance 55:21 distinction 17:19 6mPAT 21:20 distance 55:22,224 distinction 28:20 distributed 28:20 size of 56:7 distributed 28:20 distributed 29:22 demployed 5:25 employed 5:25 employed 5:25 distributed 29:22 disturbed 39:6 divide 33:13 dividing 33:22 doing 10:24 disturbed 29:16 divide 33:13 dividing 33:22 Docket 1:5 doing 10:24 14:21 17:2,4 17:5,10,14,23 18:8 20:24 21:2 23:13 30:22 23:13 30:21 distributed 29:2 23:13 30:20 dividing 33:25 bissince 1:9 environment 29:2 20:24 entities 11:9 decirate 29:2 29:23 dividing 33:22 doing 10:24 14:10 disturbed 29:2 doing 10:24 14:10 divide 33:13 dividing 33:22 doing 10:24 14:10 divide 33:13 dividing 33:22 doing 10:24 14:10 divide 33:13 dividing 33:25 door 25:10 drafting 18:17 drainage 23:12 drink 35:5 drop 25:6						
dispose 30:10 46:17 36:3,16 36:19,21 form 16:13 53:18 53:18 53:18 53:18 53:18 20:19 46:21 40:21 47:48,49:6 41:8 42:2,17 47:2 51:9 47:2 51:9 14:18 29:11 29:19 46:21 30:11:3,5 41:18 29:11 29:19 46:21 30:11:3,5 35:18 20:11:3,5 41:8 29:11 47:2 51:9 47:2 51:9 44:11 35:13 52:5 67:4 34:11 35:13 43:11 35:13 35:15 38:9 37:17 55:9 45:17 55:12						
distance 55:21 distinction EMLab 7:15 distriction 39:11 45:21 distriction 39:14 45:21 distributed 39:14 45:21 distributed 29:19 46:21 distributed 39:11 15:21 distributed 39:14 47:4,8 49:6 distributed 41:8 42:2,17 distributed 47:2 51:9 distributed 47:2 51:9 distributed 38:14 distributed 49:11,13,17 distributed 52:5 67:4 distributed 55:5 65:2 distributed 49:11,13,17 distributed 55:3,5 56:2 distributed 49:11,13,17 distributed 55:3,5 56:2 distributed 55:15 distributed 55:14 distributed 55:14 distributed 55:14 distributed 55:14 distributed 55:3,5 56:2 distributed 56:18 found 27:1,1,2 distributed 55:16 64:12 distributed 49:11,13,17 distributed 55:3,5 56:2 distributed 55:14 filed 33:5 distributed 55:16 64:12 distributed 47:14 5:19 distributed 47:15 filed 33:5 distributed 47:14 5:19 distributed 47:14 5:19 distributed 47:14 5:19 distributed 47:14 5:19 distributed 47:15 distributed 47:15 distributed 47:14 5:19 distributed 47:14 5		_				
distinction 40:21 47:4,8 49:6 41:8 42:2,17 47:2 51:9 14:18 29:11 distributed 28:20 53:5 62:9 49:11,13,17 52:67:4 47:2 51:9 14:18 29:11 56:7 District 1:1,1 4:10,10 68:18 68:18 69:18 69:18 69:18 69:14 64:12 69:14 65:11 69:18 60:16 69:14 69:14 65:11 69:18 69:14 65:12 69:10 69:18 69:18 69:14 69:10 <td></td> <td></td> <td>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,</td> <td>'</td> <td></td> <td></td>			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	'		
Semplane						
distributed 55:7 employed 5:25 63:2 64:4,10 55:3,5 56:2 Forth 2:15 55:16 64:17 64:10,10 5:24 19:14 24:17 fields 33:5 50:12 62:24 64:22 69:2 63:2 64:4,10 55:24 19:14 24:17 fields 33:5 50:12 62:24 64:22 69:2 64:26						
District 1:1,1			'		forms 66:25	5,335
4:10,10 5:24 19:14 24:17 fields 33:5 50:12 62:24 64:22 69:2 disturbance 22:24 engineering existence 9:22 fiffth 54:11 four 63:4 good 4:5 14:15 disturbed 39:6 enhanced 18:4 enhanced 18:4 expect 46:11 figure 35:1,25 37:17 55:9 front 58:12 53:15 64:1 dividing 33:22 entire 35:7 expereince filed 4:9 full 55:6 45:17 65:12 doing 10:24 entities 11:9 66:10 find 33:15 full 55:6 45:17 65:12 dividing 33:22 plocket 1:5 entities 11:9 66:10 find 33:15 full 55:6 45:17 65:12 dividing 10:24 entities 11:9 66:10 find 33:15 full 55:6 45:17 65:12 18:8 20:24 17:5,10,14,23 8:25 Environmental expertise 65:4 11:2,13 13:7 67:11 32:11 6:11 65:14 10:17,17,21 32:11 65:11 findings 26:24 10:17,17,21 32:11 6:11 67:11 28:17 30:6 22:11 5,16,21 group 6:05 22:11 6:21 37:1,4 54:16 36:23,29,4,25<	56:7	employed 5:25	63:2 64:4,10	55:3,5 56:2	Forty 12:15	42:14 55:19
disturbance engineering existence 9:22 fifth 54:11 four 63:4 good 4:5 14:15 fragments 67:3 pood 4:5 14:15 fragments 67:3 fragments 67:3 fragments 67:3 fragments 67:3 front 58:12 53:15 64:1 19:16 34:15 front 58:12 53:15 64:1 front 58:12 53:15 64:1 19:16 34:15 64:12 53:15 64:1 front 58:12 53:15 64:1 64:20 governing governing 46:20 governing governing governing 45:17 65:12 governing governing governing 45:17 65:12 governing governing governing governing 45:17 65:12 governing governing governing 45:17 65:12 governing governing governing governing 45:17 65:12 governing governing governing governing 45:17 65:12 governing governing governing governing 45:17 65:12 grade 54:11	District 1:1,1	employment	Exhibits 3:4,11	68:18	found 27:1,1,2	56:16 64:17
38:24 22:24 enhanced 18:4 enhanced 18:4 deivide 33:13 entire 35:7 56:13 experience final 62:1 final 63:15 found 54:12 final 62:1 final	4:10,10	5:24	19:14 24:17	fields 33:5	50:12 62:24	64:22 69:2
disturbed 39:6 divide 33:13 divide 33:13 divide 33:13 dividing 33:22 Docket 1:5	disturbance	engineering	existence 9:22		four 63:4	good 4:5 14:15
divide 33:13 Enrique 26:14 46:19,23 filed 4:9 fuchsin 54:12 64:20 governing doing 10:24 entities 11:9 66:10 find 33:15 full 55:6 45:17 65:12 grade 54:11 grade 54:12 finding 40:18 finding 40:18 finding 40:18 finding 40:18 finding 52:12 grade 54:12 grade 54:12 grade 54:12 grade 54:12 grade 54:12 grade 54						
dividing 33:22 entire 35:7 experience final 62:1 54:15 governing doing 10:24 entities 11:9 66:10 find 33:15 full 55:6 45:17 65:12 14:21 17:2,4 environment expert 26:7,8 41:11 55:7 fungal 6:24 grade 54:11 17:5,10,14,23 38:25 60:18 55:14,18 10:17,17,21 32:11 6:17 18:8 20:24 Environmental expertise 65:4 10:17,17,21 32:11 6:117 21:2 23:13 6:1 8:10,14 expertise 65:4 11:2,13 13:7 67:11 45:10 48:25 16:7,11,17 51:8,17 finding 40:18 18:11 21:6 grapes 60:5 54:23 55:10 17:2,10 54:13 finished 28:3 36:23,24,25 ground 5:11 58:18,23,25 27:25 expressed 13:1,4,10 28:17 30:6 ground 5:11 door 25:10 errata 70:1 extensive 19:6 27:4 61:23 65:4,8 66:11 66:16 67:19 4:1,23 drink 35:5 71:3 escape 11:22 escaping 16:2 escaping 16:2 <						
Docket 1:5 doing 10:24 doing 10:24 14:21 17:2,4 14:21 17:2,4 17:5,10,14,23 38:25 38:25 29:24 21:2 23:13 6:1 8:10,14 equipment 45:10 48:25 17:2,10 54:13 58:18,23,25 27:25 ergonomic drafting 18:17 drainage 23:12 drink 35:5 drop 25:6 dropped 47:23 due 32:3 duly 4:25 72:6 72:8 duly 4:25 72:6 72:8 doing 10:24 escape 11:22 escape 11:22 escape 13:24 fair 61:24 fairly 32:5 40:1 56:13						
doing 10:24 entities 11:9 66:10 find 33:15 fully 24:16 grade 54:11 14:21 17:2,4 38:25 60:18 55:14,18 10:17,17,21 32:11 61:17 18:8 20:24 Environmental 6:1 8:10,14 expertise 65:4 10:17,17,21 32:11 67:11 21:2 23:13 6:1 8:10,14 expertise 65:4 11:2,13 13:7 67:11 32:17 37:4 equipment explain 29:5 finding 40:18 18:11 21:6 graes 60:5 54:23 55:10 17:2,10 54:13 fine 65:11 28:17 30:6 group 6:20 58:18,23,25 27:25 express 34:15 fire 9:9 11:1 37:1,4 54:16 group 6:20 drafting 18:17 10:18 24:16 35:22 21:12 23:19 55:23 growth 36:25 drop 25:6 escape 11:22 external 9:9 external 9:9 65:4,8 66:11 G duly 4:25 72:6 16:2 20:24 58:18 52:2 36:23,24,25 37:1 72:8 57:3 escaping 16:2 external 9:9 external 9:9 66:16 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>						
14:21 17:2,4 environment 38:25 41:11 55:7 fungal 6:24 grapelike 17:5,10,14,23 38:25 60:18 55:14,18 10:17,17,21 32:11 61:17 18:8 20:24 Environmental 6:1 8:10,14 expertise 65:4 11:2,13 13:7 67:11 21:2 23:13 6:1 8:10,14 expertise 65:4 11:2,13 13:7 67:11 32:17 37:4 equipment explain 29:5 findings 26:24 21:15,16,21 grapes 60:5 45:10 48:25 16:7,11,17 51:8,17 fine 65:11 18:11 21:6 green 58:11 58:18,23,25 27:25 express 34:15 fire 9:9 11:1 37:1,4 54:16 group 6:20 60rating 18:17 drafting 18:17 drafting 18:17 drafting 18:17 drink 35:5 24:16 35:22 21:12 23:19 37:1,4 54:16 growth 36:25 30rup 25:6 group 25:6 external 9:9 external 9:9 external 9:9 external 9:9 65:4,8 66:11 66:14 66:14 66:12 9as 66:23 37:1 9as 66:23 11:17:17:17:1 17:17:17:17:1 17:17:17:17:1 17:17:17:17:1 17:17:17:1 17:17:17:1 17:17:17:1						14.11.44.11
17:5,10,14,23 38:25 60:18 55:14,18 65:4 11:2,13 13:7 67:11 67:						
18:8 20:24 Environmental expertise 65:4 11:2,13 13:7 67:11 21:2 23:13 6:1 8:10,14 30:12 65:11 finding 40:18 18:11 21:6 grapes 60:5 32:17 37:4 equipment explain 29:5 findings 26:24 21:15,16,21 grapes 60:5 45:10 48:25 16:7,11,17 51:8,17 fine 65:11 28:17 30:6 ground 5:11 54:23 55:10 17:2,10 54:13 fire 9:9 11:1 36:23,24,25 ground 5:11 58:18,23,25 27:25 express 34:15 fire 9:9 11:1 37:1,4 54:16 ground 5:20 door 25:10 ergonomic expressed 13:1,4,10 55:23 growth 36:25 drink 35:5 71:3 externsive 19:6 externsive 19:6 65:4,8 66:11 G dropped 47:23 escape 11:22 extremely 50:5 fice 20:24 71:1 72:4 H 2:6 72:8 35:12,17 58:18 fice 26:21,25 58:18 fires 31:10 66:16 25:7 72:20 E 60:16 fair 61:24 firms 13:24 general 8:10 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>						
21:2 23:13 6:1 8:10,14 30:12 65:11 finding 40:18 18:11 21:6 grapes 60:5 32:17 37:4 equipment explain 29:5 findings 26:24 21:15,16,21 green 58:11 45:10 48:25 16:7,11,17 51:8,17 fine 65:11 28:17 30:6 ground 5:11 54:23 55:10 17:2,10 54:13 finished 28:3 36:23,24,25 ground 5:11 58:18,23,25 27:25 express 34:15 fire 9:9 11:1 37:1,4 54:16 group 6:20 door 25:10 ergonomic expressed 13:1,4,10 55:23 growth 36:25 drink 35:5 71:3 externsive 19:6 external 9:9 65:4,8 66:11 group 6:20 drop 25:6 escape 11:22 extremely 50:5 fireplace 45:22 Grink 35:22 Grink 35:22 due 32:3 duly 4:25 72:6 16:2 20:24 fact 26:21,25 52:3 gas 66:23 half 39:1 duly 4:25 72:6 35:12,17 58:18 fires 31:10 66:16 25:7 72:20 F 58:18 firms 13:24 gel 29:23,24 handled 21:17 F 60:16 fairly 32:5 40:1 first 4:25 11:1		00.00				
32:17 37:4 equipment explain 29:5 findings 26:24 21:15,16,21 green 58:11 45:10 48:25 16:7,11,17 51:8,17 fine 65:11 28:17 30:6 grid 22:19 54:23 55:10 17:2,10 54:13 finished 28:3 36:23,24,25 ground 5:11 58:18,23,25 27:25 express 34:15 fire 9:9 11:1 37:1,4 54:16 group 6:20 door 25:10 ergonomic expressed 13:1,4,10 55:23 growth 36:25 drafting 18:17 10:18 24:16 35:22 21:12 23:19 group 6:20 drink 35:5 71:3 externsl 9:9 65:4,8 66:11 guess 14:18,19 dropp 25:6 escape 11:22 extermely 50:5 fireplace 45:22 Grink 35:22 Grink 35:22 due 32:3 escaping 16:2 escentially F 50:9,18 52:2 gas 66:23 half 39:1 duly 4:25 72:6 16:2 20:24 58:18 fires 31:10 66:16 25:7 72:20 Texture 58:18 firm 12:25 gel 29:23,24 handled 21:17 B 6						
45:10 48:25 16:7,11,17 51:8,17 fine 65:11 28:17 30:6 grid 22:19 54:23 55:10 17:2,10 54:13 finished 28:3 36:23,24,25 ground 5:11 58:18,23,25 27:25 express 34:15 fire 9:9 11:1 37:1,4 54:16 group 6:20 door 25:10 ergonomic 24:16 35:22 21:12 23:19 55:23 growth 36:25 drafting 18:17 10:18 24:16 35:22 21:12 23:19 55:23 growth 36:25 drink 35:5 71:3 extensive 19:6 27:4 61:23 65:4,8 66:11 guess 14:18,19 drop 25:6 escape 11:22 extermely 50:5 fireplace 45:22 46:12,17 gas 66:23 half 39:1 duly 4:25 72:6 16:2 20:24 58:18 fires 31:10 66:16 25:7 72:20 Test 3:18 58:18 fires 31:10 66:16 25:7 72:20 panded 21:17 panded 21:17 hand 19:16 25:17 72:20 firms 13:24 general 8:10 happen 15:1 E 60:16 fairly 32:5 40:1 first 4:25 11:16 8:13 29:16 hard 50:5						
54:23 55:10 17:2,10 54:13 finished 28:3 36:23,24,25 ground 5:11 58:18,23,25 27:25 express 34:15 fire 9:9 11:1 37:1,4 54:16 group 6:20 door 25:10 ergonomic 24:16 35:22 21:12 23:19 55:23 growth 36:25 drainage 23:12 errata 70:1 extensive 19:6 27:4 61:23 fungi 21:20 37:1 drop 25:6 escape 11:22 external 9:9 65:4,8 66:11 G dropped 47:23 duly 4:25 72:6 16:2 20:24 fact 26:21,25 50:9,18 52:2 gas 66:23 half 39:1 duly 4:25 72:6 16:2 20:24 fact 26:21,25 58:18 fires 31:10 66:16 25:7 72:20 E 60:16 fair 61:24 firms 13:24 gel 29:23,24 handled 21:17 E 60:16 fairly 32:5 40:1 first 4:25 11:16 8:13 29:16 hard 50:5						
58:18,23,25 27:25 express 34:15 fire 9:9 11:1 37:1,4 54:16 group 6:20 door 25:10 ergonomic 24:16 35:22 21:12 23:19 55:23 fungi 21:20 37:1 drainage 23:12 errata 70:1 extensive 19:6 27:4 61:23 65:4,8 66:11 6 6 dropped 47:23 escape 11:22 extremely 50:5 fireplace 45:22 61:19 4:1,23 H duly 4:25 72:6 16:2 20:24 fact 26:21,25 52:3 gas 66:23 half 39:1 duly 4:25 72:6 16:2 20:24 fact 26:21,25 58:18 fires 31:10 66:16 25:7 72:20 F 60:16 faculty 6:15,23 firm 12:25 gel 29:23,24 handled 21:17 E 60:16 fair 61:24 first 4:25 11:16 8:13 29:16 hard 50:5			,			
door 25:10 ergonomic drafting 18:17 expressed 13:1,4,10 55:23 growth 36:25 drainage 23:12 drainage 23:12 errata 70:1 extensive 19:6 27:4 61:23 65:4,8 66:11 G drop 25:6 escape 11:22 extremely 50:5 fireplace 45:22 G:1:19 4:1,23 H dup 4:25 72:6 16:2 20:24 F 50:9,18 52:2 gas 66:23 half 39:1 duly 4:25 72:6 16:2 20:24 fact 26:21,25 58:18 fires 31:10 66:16 25:7 72:20 E 60:16 faculty 6:15,23 firm 12:25 general 8:10 handled 21:17 E 60:16 fair 61:24 fair 61:24 first 4:25 11:16 8:13 29:16 hard 50:5						
drafting 18:17 drainage 23:12 drink 35:5 10:18 errata 70:1 extensive 19:6 external 9:9 extremely 50:5 drop 25:6 drop 25:6 due 32:3 duly 4:25 72:6 72:8 24:16 35:22 extensive 19:6 external 9:9 extremely 50:5 fireplace 45:22 doi:10. The second of the secon						
drainage 23:12 drink 35:5 drop 25:6 drop 25:6 due 32:3 due 32:3 duly 4:25 72:6 72:8 escape 11:22 essentially 39:18 49:20 60:16 E 2:13 3:1 extensive 19:6 external 9:9 extremely 50:5 fireplace 45:22 dos. 23:1 fair 61:24 fairly 32:5 40:1 27:4 61:23 dos. 65:4,8 66:11 dos. 65:4,8 66:12 dos. 66:10 dos		_				
drink 35:5 71:3 external 9:9 65:4,8 66:11 G H dropped 47:23 escaping 16:2 46:12,17 71:1 72:4 H 2:6 duly 4:25 72:6 16:2 20:24 fact 26:21,25 52:3 gas 66:23 hand 19:16 72:8 35:12,17 58:18 fires 31:10 66:16 25:7 72:20 8 fair 61:24 firm 12:25 gel 29:23,24 handled 21:17 E 60:16 fair 61:24 firms 13:24 general 8:10 happen 15:1 E 21:13 3:1 established fairly 32:5 40:1 first 4:25 11:16 8:13 29:16 hard 50:5	_					
dropped 47:23 due 32:3 duly 4:25 72:6 escaping 16:2 essentially F 50:9,18 52:2 gas 66:23 gas-phase H 2:6 half 39:1 gas-phase 72:8 72:8 35:12,17 39:18 49:20 E 2:13 3:1 58:18 fires 31:10 firm 12:25 firms 13:24 general 8:10 handled 21:17 60:16 first 4:25 11:16 first 4:25 11:16 first 4:25 11:16 8:13 29:16 hard 50:5	_	71:3	external 9:9		G	
dropped 47:23 due 32:3 due 32:3 escaping 16:2 essentially F 50:9,18 52:2 gas 66:23 gas-phase H 2:6 half 39:1 hand 19:16 72:8 72:8 72:8 35:12,17 39:18 49:20 E 2:13 3:1 58:18 faculty 6:15,23 fair 61:24 fairly 32:5 40:1 fires 31:10 fires 13:24 fairly 32:5 40:1 66:16 gel 29:23,24 general 8:10 hand ed 21:17 happen 15:1 hard 50:5			extremely 50:5		G 1:19 4:1,23	Н
due 32:3 essentially F 50:9,18 52:2 gas 66:23 half 39:1 duly 4:25 72:6 16:2 20:24 fact 26:21,25 52:3 gas-phase hand 19:16 72:8 35:12,17 58:18 fires 31:10 66:16 25:7 72:20 39:18 49:20 faculty 6:15,23 firm 12:25 gel 29:23,24 handled 21:17 E 60:16 fair 61:24 first 4:25 11:16 8:13 29:16 hard 50:5	dropped 47:23					H 2:6
duly 4:25 72:6 16:2 20:24 fact 26:21,25 52:3 gas-phase hand 19:16 72:8 35:12,17 58:18 fires 31:10 66:16 25:7 72:20 39:18 49:20 faculty 6:15,23 firm 12:25 gel 29:23,24 handled 21:17 60:16 fair 61:24 firms 13:24 general 8:10 happen 15:1 E 2:13 3:1 established fairly 32:5 40:1 first 4:25 11:16 8:13 29:16 hard 50:5					gas 66:23	half 39:1
72:8 35:12,17 58:18 fires 31:10 66:16 25:7 72:20 39:18 49:20 faculty 6:15,23 firm 12:25 gel 29:23,24 handled 21:17 60:16 fair 61:24 firms 13:24 general 8:10 happen 15:1 E 2:13 3:1 established fairly 32:5 40:1 first 4:25 11:16 8:13 29:16 hard 50:5			fact 26:21,25			hand 19:16
E 60:16 fair 61:24 firms 13:24 general 8:10 happen 15:1 fairly 32:5 40:1 first 4:25 11:16 8:13 29:16 hard 50:5	72:8	,	58:18			
E 2:13 3:1 established fairly 32:5 40:1 first 4:25 11:16 8:13 29:16 hard 50:5						
1411 52.15 5.11 0.13 25.10 1.41 30.15					_	
earlier 22:5 45:10 40:22 56:15 13:12 15:11 32:5 41:3 haystack 35:16						
	earlier 22:5	45:16	40:22 56:15	13:12 15:11	32:5 41:3	haystack 35:16
					0	X

Page 76

	i i		i	ri e	¥'
head 41:17	16:9	interesting	59:22 62:3	26:21,25	62:24
59:17		55:8		27:21 31:2	looked 30:25
	impact 41:9		62:18,20,21		
health 6:1,2	42:18 43:22	interior 36:15	62:22 65:9	46:24,24	31:13 35:3
8:10,14	43:24 44:2,7	37:19	65:11,14	51:17 58:18	37:11 66:24
30:21	impartiality	internal 9:9	66:16,18	58:19 59:4	looking 10:3,4
heard 17:17	72:19	37:15	knowing 25:19	levels 21:18	10:4 11:12
		interpret 42:14	knowledge	licensed 24:1,2	11:13 14:20
heavy 36:4,17	impossible		_		
39:15 40:2	57:9	interpretation	21:14 46:16	28:23	22:13 31:15
47:24,24	impression	18:24 19:3,6	known 68:14	licenses 7:10	35:16 36:3
49:16,17	47:16	19:7 20:13	68:17	licensing 28:7	37:14,23
59:20	in-person	20:17,19		lift 45:22	38:15 40:1
Hello 5:4	31:21	36:21,24,25	L	light 15:23	40:17,19
				16:3,5,5 17:5	l '
help 16:20	include 21:25	40:7,20	lab 15:12,17,19		42:4,7 47:16
39:19 40:13	22:1	41:13 42:2	15:23 21:23	17:23 26:5	47:18 48:22
47:21 48:7	included 18:20	42:10 47:13	22:1,20	32:15,19,21	49:8,20 53:4
54:16	63:2	52:25	27:11,17	38:6,8 39:14	55:3,21 57:9
helpful 9:11	Indemnity 1:6	interpreted	· ·	39:25 49:10	61:1 65:2
		41:5	29:19 30:9	53:11 55:12	66:20
12:2 66:5	4:8 5:6		32:25		
helps 39:18	independent	introduce 4:15	laboratories	59:19 61:13	looks 12:24
Hemlock 19:21	39:15	investigating	17:17,18,19	68:8,10,10,12	35:13 45:24
hereto 72:17	INDEX 3:4	23:1	21:4,12,15	68:15,16	50:9 57:10
high 31:8	individuals	involved 9:5	28:5	lighter 50:3	59:14 60:5
32:23	28:8.14	11:1 45:14		limit 32:19	62:10 63:2,6
	indoor 6:19,21	involving 9:5	laboratory	limited 41:1	64:14 65:24
higher 13:14			6:17 16:12		lot 35:13 38:24
46:24,24	10:19,20	Irmiter 30:15	17:22,23	42:18,21,25	
highly 45:11	industrial 6:2	40:12 65:17	21:9 22:8	43:6,8,13,14	38:25 39:2
hire 11:9,10	6:18 21:17	Irmiter's 12:20	28:21 30:20	43:17,18,22	49:14 57:8
home 10:20	28:19 29:1	irregular 32:12	30:21	44:13,17,21	lots 47:25
15:14,17,21	information	irrespective	lactic 54:12	45:3	48:21
16:4 22:1,7	10:9 25:20	8:24 47:19	Lacto 54:12,15	line 29:21	low 35:14
22:17,20	29:18,20	isolated 27:22	,	list 59:23	
	30:9	27:23	large 30:18	listed 7:16 33:7	М
27:17			31:3,10 37:1		
homeowners	initial 55:18	issues 13:2,5	larger 31:25	52:25	M 1:25 72:4,23
11:17 12:7	Inn 1:3 3:8,9		32:7	little 11:5	machine 60:14
12:11 13:3,7	4:8 5:5 19:20	J.	LaSalle 2:10	16:24 28:4	Magic 58:11
hotel 65:3	20:2,4,8	Jackson 2:4	Lately 13:12	31:7 54:18	magnification
hour 18:25	24:23 25:15	January 3:8,9	law 12:25	57:12	17:24 18:4
39:1	25:16,19,20	65:24,24,25	13:24	LLC 1:3	53:2,14 54:4
house 27:19		05.24,24,23		located 15:12	
	26:9,10		learn 64:2		57:1
housing 6:19	29:15 36:17	К	legal 2:18 4:13	27:17	magnifications
6:19	47:5,10	kind 15:22	6:11	location 23:14	54:22
huge 56:20	50:19 51:1,2	30:23 32:6	length 32:7	25:7 28:1	mail 25:8
hygiene 6:18	51:6,6,13,14	35:11 39:20	61:12	52:11 66:14	major 41:2,3,9
21:17 28:20	53:4 64:4	40:24 55:7	lens 53:25 54:5	locations 15:13	making 59:5
hygienist 6:2	65:25 66:1		54:6	long 9:22 68:22	manifest 59:8
29:1	insects 48:16	56:9 57:14	let's 8:4,22	longer 66:7	manufactured
27.1	inside 29:22,22	58:5 67:23	· ·	look 7:7,12	57:20
		kinds 59:6	10:2 14:7	11:19 12:23	
I	inspection 6:20	60:13	16:20,22		March 72:20
idea 37:7	inspections	know 5:15,22	18:4 20:2	15:8 18:1	mark 30:8
identification	23:16	7:8,16 9:4,7	24:22 28:9	19:9 20:6	marked 3:11
20:23 21:6	instance 29:20	13:25 14:2	28:12 29:23	22:14,16	7:4 19:12
40:5 54:13	33:9 35:8,9	14:16 15:24	33:18 34:17	23:14 29:11	24:25 33:20
58:14,25	55:6,12,20		34:19,19	30:4,5 32:11	marking 22:19
	57:10 58:2	17:9,12 20:6	36:22 37:23	32:23,24	master's 8:13
62:5	59:9	20:16,17		33:19 35:7	
identified		21:13 22:10	38:24 39:1		24:5
45:24 53:10	instances 23:6	24:18,21	40:6 47:4	35:11 41:20	material 17:13
identify 48:25	23:7	25:11 28:15	49:7,7 60:7	42:15,16	30:2 31:6,6
Illinois 2:11	insurance 26:2	29:12 36:19	63:4,11,22,25	47:4 49:6	61:9,10,25
illumination	intakes 23:15	39:8 40:14	level 9:16	55:19 56:4	materials 28:2
68:18	intention 39:19	41:1 46:13	17:18,18,21	56:13,16,20	60:13,21,22
immediately	interest 72:18		17:21,23	56:23 57:8	math 34:14
	interested	46:23 48:2,8	18:3,8 20:24	58:25 59:6	matte 40:2
66:6,9	72:17	50:4 52:9,21		59:12,18	matter 4:7
immersion	'2.1'	57:14,20	21:2,8 26:12	37.12,10	matter 4:7
	I	I.	I.	K.	
N					

Page 77

					rage 77
1	1	t	Î.	Ÿ.	i .
72:6,11	mind 9:24 10:7	5:4 13:20	39:22	47:20,22	65:10
MCWHERTOR	19:22	15:25 16:1	nursing 23:23	48:4,21 49:4	overall 13:9
2:3	mind's 54:10	26:12,16		49:6,15,19,21	owner 9:19
mean 34:2,22	mineral 59:17	names 11:22	0	50:1,8 51:21	
39:25 58:21	61:22	13:23	oath 72:9	51:25 52:12	P
means 20:1	minerals 59:17	narrow 57:5	Object 16:13	52:16,24	P&K 7:15 40:21
47:24 54:14	61:22	need 5:15 7:11	46:21 47:2	53:3,9,19,25	p.m 4:4,6
58:23	Minneapolis	11:19 15:15	51:9 52:5	54:4,7,10,19	64:23,24,24
measure 34:9	4:3 72:5	15:16 18:12	67:4	54:21 55:2	65:1 69:3,5
36:20	Minnesota 4:4	32:18 34:21	observe 41:8	56:1,12	package 15:3
mechanical	5:25 6:6,14	34:23 35:1	54:18	57:18 58:8	Page 3:2,7,8,9
16:25 39:9	8:7,12 15:19	35:25 45:13	observed 34:3	58:21 59:6	Page/Ln 70:2
medical 23:22	21:23 22:2,7	66:5	37:21 41:23	59:23 60:24	pages 71:1
24:1	23:8 24:5	needed 6:25	obstruction	61:3 62:4,18	paint 59:8,9
Medina 26:14	72:1,5,8	needle 35:16	49:14	62:23,25	PALANDECH
Medina's 26:23	minor 8:6	negligible 38:2	obvious 56:16	63:17,19	2:10
medium 67:23	mix 13:10	41:1,10,12	66:19	64:19 65:2,7	part 16:12 41:3
member 6:23	mixed 11:5	43:12,15,16	occasions 8:19	65:10,19,22	55:4 61:18
memory 26:6	Mm-hmm 12:4	43:17,19,20	occupancy	66:18,25	participate
meter 37:5	55:16	43:24 44:5,8	23:10	67:8,9,13,19	21:5,22
38:16	moderate 38:6	44:10,15,19	oh 10:6 18:13	67:21 68:8	50:15
method 32:17	38:8 39:14	44:21 45:4	20:12 60:7	68:17,20,20	particle 31:7
methods 53:8	39:14 41:1	Neil 1:19 4:1,7	62:4	Olympus 15:24	31:25 32:2
58:14 62:4	41:21 42:2,9	4:23 68:24	oil 16:8	once 27:9 29:5	33:17 40:7
micrometer	42:25 43:1	71:1 72:4	okay 5:11,13	30:9	40:25 41:11
34:10	44:7 45:3	never 24:1	5:15 6:7,13	one's 7:16	41:15 42:1
micrometers	moderately	New 24:8	7:4,18,25 8:4	ones 7:19,23	47:12 52:24
34:12,21	61:8	Ninth 4:3	8:7,17,25 9:3	15:25 21:5	54:23,24
micron 32:10	Modest 22:25	nonlegal 19:1	9:15,19,22	31:15 54:9	55:1 59:13
microns 60:7,8	modified 41:6	nonviable	10:6,16,25	55:12 59:7	59:25 62:5
microscope	mold 11:18	10:21 21:21	11:8,16 12:1	59:16 62:16	particles 17:25
8:19 15:14	12:5 13:2,5	North 2:10	12:13 13:3,8	67:15,17	18:6 20:22
15:18,22,24	13:11,13	notary 71:11	14:1,10,24	online 31:14	27:3 30:5,6
16:3,21 18:2	14:4 36:4,6	72:7,23	15:11,17	opaque 32:4,13	31:11,13,16
22:6,17,18	37:8,20,25	notation 36:4 37:13	16:7,11 17:2	35:12 61:8,9	31:17,20,24
27:23 29:7 29:25,25	morphology 62:6	note 30:9	17:8,12,15	open 29:22	32:9,13 33:8
30:3 31:24	Morris 8:7	note 30:9 noted 36:17	18:8,15 19:3	32:2	33:12,15
35:23 47:17	Motor 3:8 4:8	38:6 71:2	19:11,13,18	opinion 38:19	34:2 35:19
48:9 53:13	5:5 20:8	notes 59:22	21:1,11	45:12 66:2 opinions 24:16	35:22 36:19
54:10,18	25:16,20	72:10	22:20 24:1	27:6	36:20 37:21
55:4 56:2,14	26:9 47:9	noticed 65:19	24:12,14,22	opposed 5:17	38:14,16
60:10,11	51:2,6,13	72:13	24:24 25:14	11:1 58:19	39:9,22,24
66:20 67:24	53:4 66:1	notification	25:25 26:14	60:4	40:2,4 41:8
67:25	Motors 47:5	15:7	26:17,20,21	optical 32:19	41:23 42:2
microscopes	MOUNTAIN 1:3	number 3:6 4:9	27:5,9,22 28:4,21 29:5	58:9 59:2	42:12,17
16:19	mounting	9:10 31:4	29:4,21 29:5	68:10	46:2 47:18
microscopic	16:21 27:25	33:7,8,11,12	30:12 31:23	ordered 72:13	47:25 48:2 48:10 49:3
61:17	30:1 67:23	33:13,14,22	32:21,25	organism 36:9	49:11,12,17
microscopy	68:5	35:19 37:1	34:14,18,24	37:15	49:18,22
16:6 17:5,23	move 39:6,9,10	37:12,19	35:18 36:3	organisms	50:2,3,3,5,12
18:5,9 32:15	40:6 45:20	42:12,13,14	36:23 37:7	21:21 37:1	52:1,2 54:17
32:15,18,20	57:12	42:15 45:9	37:10,19	54:16	55:7,23,24
32:21 53:11	moved 30:22	45:17 47:18	38:3,17 39:5	organization	56:6 58:15
61:14 68:9	multiple 8:19	47:22 49:6,7	39:11 40:6	21:24 22:21	58:16,22,24
68:11,14,17		49:8,9,10,15	40:14 41:14	organizations	59:6,8,9,13
microtoxins	N	49:21 50:12	41:18 42:7,8	21:3 28:23	59:23 60:2
24:8	N 3:1	50:19,21	42:11,19	28:24	60:13,20
Midwest 6:24	N.G 6:3,4,7,10	51:13,14,18	43:8,20 44:5	origin 27:4	61:16,20
millimeter 36:1	6:11,12 9:19	51:18,23,23	44:10,24	original 20:10	66:19,21
37:8	10:16,17	56:6,10	45:20 46:6,9	61:9 72:12	67:2
millimeters	11:9	64:12	46:14,19	outcome 72:17	particular 10:8
34:16,21	name 4:12,13	numerous	47:5,7,12,15	outside 32:19	32:24 37:2
	/				

Page 78

			20 22 20 46		. 160.40
particularly	61:8	problem 11:19	28:22 29:16	referred 28:18	required 60:18
56:6,19	plaintiff 1:4	37:18 56:16	40:13,24	36:11	residence
particulate	2:7 4:19	problems	46:8,10,15,18	referring 29:15	15:14 25:8
10:22 17:13	plan 23:3,8	35:14	46:22 51:11	53:6 68:13	residual 48:14
parties 31:19	plastic 29:9	proceed 4:22	53:6,15	reflected 68:12	residue 8:21,23
72:13,17,17	PLC 2:3	process 21:19	63:18 66:19	reflective	21:12 46:7
party 72:13	please 4:15	29:6 61:19	questions	68:15,16	48:22
Paul 6:20	plus 35:10 46:2	61:19	68:21,24	refraction	respect 6:6,19
PC 2:10	50:13,16	produce 60:14	quite 45:24	59:19	7:23 8:1
PCG 11:21,23	51:17 52:1	produced 31:7	quite isiz:	regulations	10:22 11:24
12:22,24	point 7:21 8:17	31:8,10 36:8	R	65:12,14	12:3 19:20
13:18	11:11 25:14	61:18		related 7:2	20:4,8 22:25
penicillium	41:14	product 61:7	radius 34:19,19	12:5,5 26:1	23:1,15 24:5
		62:2	range 9:11		
36:9,13	polarized 68:8		11:3 14:7,13	72:16	25:15 26:9
people 11:8	68:10	production	20:20 34:12	relative 20:21	28:10,12,17
40:19 57:24	PONZI 2:10	60:19 61:23	38:7 49:12	39:21	28:19 29:10
66:9	poor 46:22	professional	56:5 60:7	released 61:23	30:6,8 31:2,5
percent 11:7	63:18	45:12	rate 72:14	relevant 7:13	33:3,6 38:5
12:12,15,16	portions 7:1	program 24:6	ratio 61:12	7:17,20,22	46:16 47:9
13:9,22 41:7	position 5:24	progressed	read 68:24	62:17	49:23 56:22
54:12 57:3	6:13	13:15	71:1	reliable 38:20	60:18 67:20
percentage	positions 30:22	project 23:14	reading 27:1	relying 39:8	respond 27:8
10:25 12:6	possibilities	proper 23:11	72:15	remediating	restate 51:10
13:14 49:23	52:17	properties	really 34:21	65:15	resulting 30:25
56:24 57:6	possible 27:4	25:23,24	35:14 55:12	remediation	results 19:4,5
performed	post 23:5	26:13 58:9	56:8 57:2,5,5	6:24 66:11	20:18 61:8
22:10	potential 51:25	59:2		remember	retained 25:3
		property 9:6	59:20	13:21 40:16	retardant 65:4
person 37:14	precise 9:10		reason 36:7		65:8
39:19	prepare 18:25	proportion	70:2	remodeling 23:13	
personal 11:16	presence 52:1	37:20 46:6	reasonable		review 23:3,9
12:7 13:3,7	present 2:17	46:10,16	34:25	rephrase 5:22	23:11 26:8
personally	4:15 31:16	51:22	reasons 51:25	report 3:8,9	reviewed 7:14
25:6 28:23	40:4 67:17	protocol 23:20	recall 13:20,23	18:17,21,22	26:1,7 65:3
45:19	presented	45:16	14:2,6 16:3	18:23,25	right 5:9 7:7
persons 72:18	29:18	provide 19:4	22:12 24:11	19:9,20 20:4	14:14 15:17
pertinent 8:14	President 6:3	20:16 21:3	25:13 26:4,6	20:7 24:22	15:20 17:17
phase 66:23	presumption	public 6:2	26:12,15	27:2,6 28:2	20:3,10 21:9
phone 2:5,12	59:5	71:11 72:7	27:7 29:9	29:19 33:20	21:25 24:25
10:9 15:1,5	presumptive	72:23	40:11,16,17	47:8 49:6	27:7,9,18
photo 10:8	32:17 59:1	publication	48:4 59:16	53:5 63:10	29:14 32:22
48:5,7	62:5	41:14	receive 27:9,14	63:12,25	33:21 34:11
photographs	pretty 62:8	publications	45:9	64:10 65:22	36:15 38:12
18:20,21	previously	7:10	received 23:23	reported 72:4	38:14 42:19
62:9,10,12,15	28:19 68:7	purchased	24:10 25:14	reporter 4:21	42:25 43:17
62:19 63:3,7	primarily 11:10	30:18	31:18	5:18	43:18 44:15
	11:12 13:1,7	purpose 8:19		reporter's 4:12	45:6 46:2
63:9,16		1 ' '	recollection	Reporting 4:2	
64:14,15	15:2,21 23:7	9:16 57:21 purposes 6:11	26:23 27:5		48:2,18,18 50:23 51:5
photos 18:22	31:6,8 37:2	1 ' '	recommenda	4:14	
22:16,17,18	38:4 41:5	put 7:9 18:22	65:15,19	reports 9:8	51:17 53:4
pi 34:17	54:15	54:2 68:7	record 4:6 10:3	19:14 23:17	57:20 60:10
pick 32:16,16	primary 10:19	puts 56:9	35:4 64:23	26:7,8,11	62:4 63:25
32:18	37:3 41:23	putting 18:23	65:1 69:3	39:18 40:18	64:4,7,21
pictures 64:8	prior 3:11		recovery 38:22	63:6,16,20	65:15 67:8
piece 10:8	13:13	Q	red 16:22	65:20 66:1	69:1
16:25 30:25	probably 5:10	qualified 46:8	57:16	represent 5:5	Road 2:3
56:22 59:20	7:19 9:13	46:9,14,17	reddish 54:20	12:11,12	Rocky 1:3 3:8
pieces 6:22	11:4,7 12:14	47:1 52:6	refer 9:24 10:9	52:15	4:8 5:5 20:8
place 29:19,24	14:8,22 19:8	quality 6:21	19:9 35:9	representative	25:16,19
30:1,2 40:12	19:16 24:10	10:19,21	36:21	56:21	26:9 47:5,9
placed 25:9	26:15 27:13	question 5:13	reference 36:4	representing	51:2,5,13
67:25 68:4,5	35:11 40:23	5:21 7:25	36:6 58:18	6:4	53:4 66:1
68:6	41:12 49:12	20:10 24:18	references	require 51:20	role 23:6 45:6
plainer 32:1	62:16	27:8 28:10	31:14	51:24	roofing 23:13
pidilici 52.1	02.10	27.0 20.10	J1.17		20.10
	A.		• 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	<u> </u>	

Page 79

					. aga , b
	1	i	ř.	ř	î
room 27:22,23	64:15 65:2,5	seminar 24:7	26:19 36:14	54:17 55:9	spots 32:3
33:22 36:15	65:23,23	40:21	68:22	58:24 59:1,2	35:12
37:19 41:13	66:3,13	seminars 7:10	sit 26:22 37:7	59:6,15 60:2	spray 59:9
41:21 45:21	sampling 23:20	send 25:3,3,5	40:14	60:5,20 61:4	square 34:15
47:23	52:11,14	sending 11:24	six 63:5 64:9	61:15,16	36:1 45:18
rough 11:3	saw 18:18 65:9	39:19	size 32:10 34:5	66:16 67:1	St 6:20
34:7 39:25	saying 15:5	sends 14:24	34:6,6,8	67:20	stage 30:3
60:4 61:18	22:3,4 39:20	sense 42:17	35:18 60:7,8	soot-like 20:22	stain 54:12,15
roughly 12:15	59:1	sent 13:19 25:9	sized 61:16	30:5 40:7	stand 12:22
34:20	says 33:25	separate 18:10	skin 48:14	42:1 47:12	
					standard 5:11
RPR 1:25 72:4	47:23 49:22	54:16	skip 45:1	49:3 52:24	41:15 45:16
72:23	53:10 54:12	September	slide 29:7,23	58:15,21,21	start 28:12
RUDOLPH 2:10	58:14,21	10:23	29:25 57:25	59:12,24	55:10
rules 5:11	62:4	Service 30:21	67:24,25	sorry 6:10 10:4	started 10:23
run 17:12	scale 39:21	session 6:22	68:4,5	42:7 47:3	10:24 13:12
runs 13:2	scan 55:6,18	20:20	slides 16:21	62:21	14:21
rush 18:12,13	56:17	set 15:14,17	slight 54:20	sort 12:8 30:7	State 72:1,8
18:14	Sciences 12:18	23:10 27:23	slightly 7:25	32:4 41:15	stated 20:23
	12:19 13:10	45:13	33:3 41:6	55:25	States 1:1 4:10
S	14:4	sets 26:8	59:8,19	sounds 14:15	stating 20:24
Safety 6:1	scope 16:2	setting 16:9	small 32:11	64:1	stays 54:8
	45:13	settled 39:7	33:11 56:18	source 8:24 9:9	stenographic
sample 14:25					
16:24 17:25	Scotch 16:22	seven 63:5	smaller 50:6	9:9 37:15	72:10
18:1,1,12,12	57:16 58:1,7	shadows 57:11	60:1	39:16	Stephen 2:18
27:10,14	Scott 2:3,6	sharp 32:4	Smith 2:18	South 4:3	4:13
29:10,20	4:19,19	61:13	4:13	southwest	stop 35:1,4
30:24 31:12	16:13 46:21	Sharps 27:24	smoke 7:15	27:19	straight 19:1,2
	47:2 51:9	30:10	42:18 66:9	space 37:16	Street 2:10 4:3
33:22 35:10					
36:16 37:19	52:5 63:12	sheet 70:1 71:3	snapshot 66:13	speaks 64:2	19:21
38:7,22,23	64:21 67:4,7	sheetlike 61:11	sole 9:19	specialist 6:2	strictly 60:16
39:4,5,20	68:24	sheets 32:6,7	solid 66:23	specific 7:23	strike 35:3
41:6,7,20	SEAL 72:20	shifted 13:12	solid-phase	8:3,16,22	63:13,18
43:6,8,12,22	second 11:20	13:14	66:21	18:5 21:7,11	structure 11:23
	26:3	ship 25:8	somebody	21:14,23	
43:24 44:2,7					structures
44:13,17,21	section 33:10	show 7:4	11:19	26:23 28:25	61:17 67:12
45:25 47:22	40:7 53:7	shown 51:12	somewhat	31:15 37:4,9	stuck 54:10
48:22 49:7,7	see 7:12 8:4,22	51:14	31:17 59:12	60:21 65:19	students 6:18
49:9 50:9,9	10:2 14:7	shows 31:12	59:18 67:10	68:16	stuff 23:3
50:15,18,19	15:9 16:23	side 27:24,25	soot 7:15 8:23	specifically	styles 30:19
	20:2 24:17	29:24	9:16 10:23	8:14 29:9	
50:21 51:1,1					31:1,2
51:13,14,18	29:12 33:18	sign 27:12,14	11:13,13	57:21 65:14	submicron
51:18,22,23	33:23,25	27:15 68:25	12:6 13:14	66:24	61:16
56:19,25	34:17 36:22	Signature 71:7	13:16 14:5	specify 9:8	subrogations
66:10 68:4	36:25 37:23	significant	14:16 18:11	spectrum	40:22
samples 11:24	39:12 40:1,2	23:19 37:12	27:2 28:11	61:24	substance
15:6 16:18	40:3,8 45:21	41:1 44:2	28:13 30:13	speculate	12:10 61:4
	45:22 46:7				
19:20 23:21		signing 72:15	31:5,7,9,11	51:20,24	substances
25:4,11,15	46:11,19,23	similar 11:23	31:13,15,19	sphere 60:3,6	49:24
28:17 29:6,8	48:4,5 49:13	11:23 31:17	31:23 32:9	spheres 59:11	substantial
29:10 32:24	49:21 50:5	36:8 40:19	33:7 37:3,21	59:11	72:18
33:1,2,4 35:6	52:25 53:24	40:22 46:10	38:1,2 41:24	spherical 32:10	Suffice 25:14
	55:11,13,14	58:24,25	43:12,15,17	spheroidal	48:21
35:7 38:18					
38:18,19,20	56:5,5,10	59:12,15,18	43:18,19,20	60:3 61:16	suggesting
38:23 39:1,3	57:9,10	60:15	43:25 44:5,8	split 27:21	37:14
41:6 44:10	58:13,16	sir 5:8,14,16,20	44:11,15,19	spore 10:17,21	suggestion
45:7,9,12,15	59:14 63:4	5:23 6:9,15	44:22 45:4	21:16	27:3
45:17,20	63:11 65:7	7:3,6 9:21,24	46:4,6,11,17	spores 11:2	Suite 2:4,11
	66:8 67:16	10:4,7 11:12	46:19,24	12:5 21:15	4:3
48:9 50:8,10					
56:7 57:15	seeing 26:4	12:19,21	48:11 49:1	36:5,6,7 37:2	sure 9:12 10:1
57:22 58:5	31:3,3 48:10	17:20 19:9	50:4,12,16	37:5,8,8,20	11:10 12:23
62:13 63:9	57:13 67:15	20:2,5,9,12	51:5,6,12,14	37:25 38:8	14:6,11
63:15,20	seen 12:24	20:15 22:22	51:18,18,22	spot 28:2 37:14	16:15,17
= 00,10,20					
61.3 5 7 7 11	39:1/57:23	75:1.13 71 74	57:1.7 [3]	7/1/	
64:3,5,7,7,11	39:17 57:23	25:1,13,21,24	52:1,2,13	57:12	19:15,24,25
64:3,5,7,7,11	39:1/ 57:23	25:1,13,21,24	52:1,2,13	57:12	19:15,24,25

Page 80

	r	,	1	VI	ys
22:3,15	6:21,23	thorough 59:3	true 19:19 20:7	16:5,8,17,21	51:2,5,13
· ·		thought 53:13	47:8 72:10		
24:20 26:3	teaching 6:14			16:21,21,22	53:4 66:1
29:8,13	6:15,17	65:7	truth 72:6,6	16:23 22:1,6	way 6:5 15:7
35:15 38:6	tease 18:1	thousands	try 37:16	22:7 35:19	25:25 33:16
48:6 50:22	27:24 35:10	49:18	trying 13:6	46:11 54:15	40:19 41:4
54:15 59:4	41:5,7 52:14	three 54:21	20:12 48:25	57:19,25	61:1,6
60:22 67:9	56:7 68:1,4	59:23 62:10	52:14 55:9	58:6,7 68:8	ways 15:2 25:5
68:3,4,13	technique 36:9	62:15 63:4	59:21	68:12,19	25:8 30:17
surface 38:20	68:14,15,16	64:15 67:12	Tweezers	uses 57:14	we're 22:3
38:22 39:4,5	68:17	time 4:6 5:15	16:25	usually 36:23	29:15 67:13
57:21 58:3,3	telephonically	18:22 19:16	two 6:22 11:10	64:2	we've 7:4
suspension	2:7	30:20 59:21	15:13 16:18		13:15 29:14
66:8	tell 12:6 22:16	63:25 64:23	18:10 26:8	V	49:15 56:16
swear 4:21	38:7 49:16	65:1 66:3,7	36:10 55:14	v 1:5 4:8	62:8 64:4,17
switch 58:1,3	51:21 56:24	66:12,14	63:4,6,11,20		webinar 7:14
	57:11 72:6	68:21 69:3	type 17:14	variability 39:3	welcome 68:22
sworn 4:25				56:10	
72:6	temp 60:17	times 5:9 9:15	23:2,10	variable 38:23	went 53:13
system 23:9	temperature	14:3,16	29:14 32:3	39:4 45:11	wide 11:17
systems 23:12	31:8 52:11	32:22 34:17	33:8,12 41:8	variables 38:25	57:5,6
	60:18	56:25 57:3	47:19 55:19	varies 12:11,14	width 32:7
T	tend 32:10	tint 54:20	types 11:8 18:6	12:15 57:2	61:13
	38:23 60:16	tiny 60:5	47:25 48:2		wildfire 7:2,3
table 40:6,10		,		variety 11:17	
40:15 47:13	tendency 72:18	titled 39:11	48:21 49:1	31:2	7:22,24 8:2,3
54:23	tends 39:4	today 26:22	59:23 60:21	ventilation	8:14,15,16,20
tables 53:3	Tennessee 1:1	37:7 40:14	typical 36:24	23:9	8:23 9:6,10
take 11:19 19:8	2:4 4:11	told 57:19	45:9 46:6,10	versus 5:5	46:7,20,25
23:14 27:11	term 66:17,23	Tom 12:20	typically 6:22	viable 10:21	65:12
29:10,21	terms 13:8	30:15 40:12	16:8,9 29:8	video 31:11	witness 4:21
	30:12 32:25	top 29:25 30:2	31:25 32:9		4:24 52:8
30:3 34:17	34:14 35:18	41:17 54:1,5	33:4,5 36:20	videographer	64:19 67:5,8
35:5 45:15		'		2:18 4:5,13	
49:7 62:15	39:14 61:24	54:8 59:16	37:16 41:5	4:20 64:20	68:22 69:1
63:25 64:18	65:15	topics 7:2	48:10 50:2	64:22,25	72:5,20
66:11	terribly 57:8	total 42:12	55:6,16 56:3	69:2	wondering
taken 1:25 4:1	test 17:12	47:18 63:6,7	59:7,10,11	Videotape 1:17	60:12
10:8 22:17	testified 52:6	63:20 64:4	60:1,2,6 61:7	4:1 72:4	wood 30:19,20
	56:12,12	touched 62:8	61:8,19,22		30:23,25
23:24 39:1	testifies 5:1	toxicologist	01.0,13,22	videotaped 4:7	31:1,7 45:21
45:7,17		_		view 54:24	
50:19 62:12	testimony 22:5	24:12,15	U	viewed 53:11	46:12 52:2,3
64:24 65:23	thank 4:20	toxicology 24:3	uh-huh 5:17	54:21	words 33:15
takes 18:21	5:23 10:4,7	24:4,6	uh-uh 5:18	viewing 35:23	39:23 41:4
talk 24:22 53:8	53:20,21	trace 30:8 33:6	unable 36:10	56:25	55:21 66:21
talked 28:18	54:4 68:21	33:16 38:13	36:12	virtue 72:8	work 6:3,7
30:17	thereof 72:8	39:12 41:20	undergraduate	visual 17:5,24	10:19,25
	they'd 7:19	42:4,9 47:15			11:21 12:3,7
talking 12:17	thin 32:6,8	47:23 49:9	8:4	visually 30:4	
16:16 49:11		49:15 56:23	understand	30:13 31:19	13:1,2,8,9
tape 16:22	61:12		5:21 16:14	58:25	15:21 24:8
18:1 27:24	thing 19:7	65:7	52:21 61:3		45:10
33:2 35:6,10	27:11 51:5	traces 53:10	understanding	W	wouldn't 8:22
36:10 41:5,7	51:12	65:4	36:3	wait 5:11,12	9:7,24 50:4
45:20,22	think 6:11,12	trained 17:15	understood	waived 72:15	write 29:17
48:22 49:24	7:13,16,19,23	training 8:13	22:5 50:8		write-up 28:1
	13:6,6 16:25	23:22,23		wall 36:15	
50:8 52:14	i i	24:3,4 30:12	uneven 32:14	37:20	V
56:7,13,19,25	20:12,19	,	uniform 56:18	want 14:19,25	X
57:4,6,14,17	21:5 26:3,15	31:18,22	unit 38:1	17:9 26:3	X 3:1
57:17 58:4,5	26:16 27:13	transcribe 5:19	United 1:1 4:10	44:25 53:8	xerogel 67:1
58:11,12	34:11 35:9	transcribed	units 37:25	55:5,11 59:3	
65:23 68:1,4	40:12,20	72:11	university 5:25	67:8	Υ
68:6	41:3,12 52:5	transcript 71:1	6:6,13 8:7,12		
	54:11 56:12	72:10,10		water 23:2	yeah 12:3,9
tapes 57:20	62:8 66:5,22	Travelers 1:6	15:19 21:23	35:5	18:14,16
tartan 16:22	· ·		22:6,18 23:8	Waters 1:3 3:8	19:10 20:1
57:17	third 31:18	4:8,18 5:5,6	24:5 25:7	4:8 5:5 20:8	20:16 22:5
taught 7:1	third-party	trigger 24:19	UPS 25:9	25:16,19	25:17 29:3
teach 6:16,18	31:21	triggers 27:8	use 15:18 16:1	26:9 47:5,9	35:2,21,24,24
	l .		Į l		,,
	nr		·		

Page 81

1					rage of
		7		N/ KC	
38:2 42:22	13 3:8,9 44:7	38305 2:4	85 54:12	ľ	
		3M 16:22 57:16	05 54.12		
43:1,1,3,5,16	14 44:10				
43:19 50:25	1400 2:11	3rd 65:24	9	l l	
51:10 52:8	150 14:22	72:20	9 33:22 35:19		
52:18,20	18:25 34:12		43:8,20,22		
53:2,25	16 44:10	4	96 10:15		
55:18 57:19	17 44:13	4 17:18,21			
62:7,11,14	19 3:8 44:17,25	20:24 26:12			
67:15,22,25	45:1,3				
	43.1,3	26:21,25			
year 11:1		42:25 43:1			
12:14	2	43:15 47:22			
years 10:13	2 3:8 10:23	49:8,15,21			
yep 41:22	19:14,19	58:19 59:4		[
42:24 43:7	20:3 24:17	40 12:15,15			
43:11,14,14	24:25 33:20	13:9 57:3			
43:16 63:5					
	33:25 34:2	400 54:25 55:1			
York 24:8	35:19,22	56:25			
YouTube 31:11	36:3,16	400x 33:5 34:7			
	39:11 42:2	52:25 53:11			
Z	45:21 49:7,9	54:22			
Ziploc 29:9	50:19,22,24	407 36:15			
zoom 35:11	51:1,14,19,23	37:19 41:21			
	63:2 64:4	45:21			
55:5,8,10,14					
55:16,24	2:25 64:23,24	40X 15:25 16:4			
56:2,3	2:33 64:24	412 33:22			
	65:1	450 4:3,3	i ii		
0	2:40 69:3,5	4th 65:24,24,25			
	20 3:9 5:10	4X 15:25 16:4			
1	9:13 44:21				
	50:12,15	5			
1 3:7 7:4 17:18	· ·				
17:21,23	56:10 60:7	5 3:2 18:21			
18:3,8 21:2,8	63:20 64:5,7	49:12 57:2			
29:20 33:25	200 9:18 14:8	50 11:7 12:16			
34:2 35:19	34:12 54:24	14:22 18:12			
35:22 36:1	2000 13:13	35:10 41:7			
	200x 53:11	46:2 50:13			
37:19,24,25	54:22 55:7	50:16 51:17			
41:11,20,24	2011 10:24				
41:24 42:16	I	52:1 57:3			
42:19,20	2018 3:8,9	54 2:3			
43:12 50:9	65:25	5th 65:25			
50:12 51:1	2020 1:25 4:2				
51:13,18,23	72:5,20	6			
58:19 71:1	20X 16:4	6 43:6,17			
	222 2:10	60 32:22 53:16			
1,000 37:24,25	25 12:12 33:5				
37:25 38:5	33:13,15	53:24 54:1			
10 5:10 10:12	28 1:25	600 14:9 53:14			
13:22 38:7		54:2 57:16			
38:10 39:24	28th 4:2 72:5	58:1,7			
42:2 43:24		60601 2:11			
49:21 50:15	3	60x 15:25 16:4			
53:15 54:1,8	3 3:9 19:14	16:7 53:13			
57:2	20:6 24:17	53:14			
	47:4,8 49:6				
100 9:14,18		69 71:2			
34:20 54:24	53:5 60:7				
100x 53:11	62:9 64:10	7			
54:22 55:2,7	3:19-CV-6 1:5	7 3:7			
55:21	4:9	731.664.1340			
105 47:23	30 50:12 56:11	2:5			
10x 15:25 16:4	60:8	75 11:7 38:11			
53:15,15	30-liter 38:18	, J 11./ JU.11			
	312.863.5000				
11 63:7	2:12	8			
12 44:2 50:9,15		8 49:21			
12:55 4:4,6	35 18:10				
	I.			1.1	
S-					